THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. IV APRIL, 1922 No. 22

EDITORIAL

THE PLEA FOR A DOCTRINAL COMMISSION

The publication of the memorial on the subject of doctrinal agreement addressed to the Archbishop of Canterbury by the Bishop of Oxford on behalf of twenty-seven signatories, and of the Archbishop's reply, took place too late in February for allusion to it to be possible in our March number. His Grace, while sympathetic, asks for the further elucidation of certain points, and possibly the restatement of the proposal in rather different terms. Opinion appears to be divided in the Church as to how much may be hoped from any effort to reach and to express a doctrinal synthesis, which shall deal with the living issues of religion. Our own view has been expressed sufficiently often in these columns, and we need not repeat it. But meanwhile we must emphasize the fact that no other policy is in the field for the purpose of dealing with the apologetic and the pastoral problems which arise out of our divergent schools of teaching. The memorialists' claim is, in effect, that these problems are soluble because the divergences are not ultimate; they beg that existing difficulties may be approached on this assumption, at least in the first instance; and they ask that a body of competent scholars may be duly commissioned to essay the task of synthesis, and its work be commended by our authorities to the prayers of the Church.

ORGANS OF RELIGIOUS AUTHORITY

BEFORE passing on to a discussion of the practical problems of religious authority, it may be as well to remind ourselves of the importance of the fact that the attitude of dependence on authority is deep-rooted in the instinctive nature. That the utterances of the religious teacher will be received in an attitude in which passive acceptance and not critical scrutiny is dominant is a psychological fact which we cannot afford to ignore. It is to the ignoring of this fact that the airy dismissal of the problems of authority by theological writers of a certain type owes both its charm and its weakness. If the attitude of mind which we may call *academic* in the best sense—the attitude of critical receptivity, of suspension of judgment, of distaste for hasty translation into action of accepted ideas—were the common attitude for the greater number of the members of a religious community, the practical problem of religious authority would be a very different one. As a matter of fact, we know that this is not the case. If a responsible official of the Church makes a statement in public, it is not regarded by most of those who hear it as a mere expression of opinion, to be judged by the weight of evidence brought forward in its favour. It is accepted as, in some measure at least, "authoritative." This compelling power of propositions to gain assent is felt less strongly for the utterances of any individual, however great his prestige, than it is for those which come directly or indirectly from the group or society to which the person assenting to the propositions in question belongs. The public utterances of an official of the Church are received as authoritative chiefly because he is felt to be the representative of the Church. This acceptance by the individual of the propositions of the society as authoritative receives its psychological explanation in the theory which regards it as due to herd-suggestion. If we wish to push the enquiry as to its origin farther back into the realms of biology, we may trace the existence of herd-suggestion to the fact that man is a gregarious animal with a gregarious animal ancestry.

Before passing on to the rational justification of this submission of the opinion of the individual to that of the body, it may be as well to say a few words in explanation of the theory of suggestion here referred to. By herd-suggestion is meant a process continually and powerfully acting on the mind of every individual in contact with his fellow-men. Dr. Rivers regards unwitting suggestion as the normal means of communication between the individuals in a herd of gregarious

animals.* It is this that makes the herd act as if it had a single mind. Man is a gregarious animal, and retains this sensitiveness to herd-suggestion. An example of its use may be found in a crowded pavement, where each individual hurries along on his own business, paying no conscious attention to the movements of others. No collisions take place, however, because each individual unconsciously divines the intentions of those near him, and regulates his own motions accordingly. If this view of herd-suggestion be correct, it follows that it must be considered as a powerful influence in the mental life of man. It may be supposed to account for the close similarity in thought and belief of different members of a group. To it we may refer the waves of feeling which pass over a whole community, when, for example, a country is attacked or is felt to be insulted. A large part of the mass of opinions which every man holds strongly, although he has not thought them out for himself, may be attributed to the influence of herd-suggestion. Even in those opinions which he is convinced he has thought out it seems unlikely that he has really escaped from its influence. His methods of thought, the things he has assumed as axiomatic, are all more or less determined for him by the society to which he belongs. Herd-suggestion is thus a powerful force influencing all his opinions and judgments, and determining his attitude towards such a society as his Church, and the pronouncements of its representatives.

This tracing of it to its psychological and biological roots explains, but does not justify, the submission of the individual to the authority of the community in matters of belief. It might be true that man had an inherent disposition to accept the authority of his teachers, even if that disposition were nothing but a weakness, which it was the business of the enlightened person to eliminate as completely as possible from himself. It will be argued later in this article that the rational justification for the attitude in question must lie in the fact that the community has a wider experience on which to base its teachings than that of any individual. In order to maintain this, it is not necessary to subscribe to the theory that the community has, in any sense, a psychic life of its own apart from those of the individuals composing it. The experience of the Christian community need mean only the experience of all the individuals composing it. This may fairly claim to be richer than that of any one individual, however richly endowed with spiritual gifts and knowledge he may be.

We may usefully preface a discussion of the practical problems connected with authority in real life by making a

* *Instinct and the Unconscious*, by Dr. W. H. R. Rivers.

distinction between what we may call "dogmatic" and "disciplinary" authority. This is, in effect, the difference between saying, "This is false," and "This may not be taught."

Some measure of dogmatic (or intellectual) authority is unavoidable where the actions of many people are determined largely by their belief in propositions whose truth they cannot verify for themselves. Even in science this is in a very large measure the case. All of us perform many actions dictated by the dogmatic authority of the community of scientific thought, although we personally have had no opportunity of verifying the truth of the propositions which dictate our acts. We accept, for example, the statement of medical science that strong sunshine falling on the skin over the *medulla oblongata* will cause severe illness and perhaps death, and we protect this part of our necks from the sun. The man who refuses to accept this authority, but insists on verifying the proposition on which its prohibitions rest, we do not revere as a nobly independent spirit; we consider him a fool. Our acceptance of such dogmatic authority is the result of the fact that it is founded on a wider experience than we can have ourselves.

This is a condition which is found pre-eminently in religion. It is often thought that the modern man, impatient of creeds, can find no room for dogmatic authority of any kind in his religion. Yet if we claim no more for religious dogma than we do for scientific and medical dogma—that it is founded on a common experience which is wider than our own can ever be, or sometimes even than we could wish it to be—that is sufficient to justify the retention of dogmatic authority in religion. But it does more than justify its retention, it indicates a real danger which must result from its neglect. If a man says that, until he has experienced all the joys and the trials of the saints and martyrs, the mystics and prophets, he will not accept the authority which has its roots in those experiences, have we any more reason for feeling respect for his attitude than we have for that of the man who refuses to wear a hat until he has experienced sunstroke? If the deepest insight into truth comes from the experience of the many, is not such an individual simply making it certain that he is missing the truth?

It is necessary here to make a distinction which is too often overlooked in hasty justifications of religious authority. A dogmatic authority worthy of acceptance need not be infallible. There is a clear difference between the position that the propositions of a certain body ought to be believed, because they are more likely to be right than any private opinion we may have opposing them, and the position that they are absolutely certainly true. This is a distinction we always make in practice

when we submit ourselves to any other authority than that of the religious community. We obey the authority of medical science, not because we suppose it ever to be infallible, but because we know that it is " on the whole " very much more true than our own opinions on the subjects of which it treats. We do not suppose that, in any particular point in dispute, it is quite certainly true. There is always a chance that, in any point on which we differ from the doctor, we may be right and he may be wrong. But, if we are wise, we submit ourselves to his judgment, because we know he is right in many more cases than we are.

Now, it is this element of " on-the-wholeness " in the truth of its propositions that is denied by a religious authority claiming to be infallible. To the question of why we consider the reasons given for this claim to be inadequate we will return later. At present, the point it is required to emphasize is that the existence and the value of dogmatic authority do not imply the infallibility of that authority.

We will now turn to the question of disciplinary authority. The necessity for some measure of disciplinary authority in ecclesiastical matters would probably be denied by few. We must remember that acceptance of propositions put forward with the weight of a great prestige behind them is a psychological fact. If a dignitary of the Church, with the weight of the prestige due to his position supporting him, enunciated theories felt by the body of the Church to be incompatible with the Christian faith, they would be accepted by his flock with a readiness which would be inconceivable if he were speaking merely as a private individual. It is obvious that in such a case the Church not only may, but must, deny to that dignitary the right to preach such doctrines. In this case, we may notice that the Church need not say that the doctrines are wrong, but only that it is undesirable that they should be taught. It is conceivable that in the end it might turn out that they were true, and that the fear of their doing harm to the faith was groundless. But this possibility would not invalidate the right of the Church to have exercised disciplinary authority in this way. She was right to have prevented prestige belonging to an office in the Church from having been used to enforce teachings which were uncertain, and which appeared to be dangerous.

Similarly, the exercise of disciplinary authority might well be used against the authoritative teaching of scientific or other truths when they were still uncertain. Nothing could be more fatal to the spirit of detachment which should characterize scientific research than if the scientist knew that his results, even when they were in the experimental stage, were being used

as foundations for new systems of morality and new religious movements. Even more necessary is the exercise of disciplinary authority when an official of the Church uses his position to teach with authority his own religious or political peculiarities of belief.

We may sum this up by saying that the essential foundation of the necessity for disciplinary authority is the fact that the Christian community has an authority of its own, and that the prestige of this authority is imparted to its officials (and, to some extent, to all of its members) when they speak in its name. Many of the abuses of disciplinary authority in the past have been due to an insufficient distinction having been made between mere tentative opinions of private individuals and dogmatic teachings of persons holding positions of authority in the Church.

It should be clear that there is no easy way out for the solution of the problems connected with the reasonable and moderate exercise of authority in ecclesiastical matters by an indefinite increase in the disciplinary exercise of authority at the expense of dogmatic authority. The exercise of the latter is a process having a rational basis—the greater extent of the experience of the community than that of any one of the individuals composing it. However "rational" we made up our minds to be, it would be necessary for us, as Christians, to take into account the experience of the community expressed in its dogmas, as one of the rational guides towards truth. But the exercise of disciplinary authority is comparatively irrational; it is necessarily concerned with expediency rather than with truth. No religious community could show itself less worthy of our respect than would one which made no strong appeal to its knowledge of truth from the reality of its own experience, but which was concerned chiefly with seeing that its ministers taught nothing dangerous—which depended entirely on the disciplinary and not on the dogmatic exercise of its authority.

One particular danger of the excessive exercise of disciplinary authority in matters of faith is the fact that it very much weakens the impressiveness of any argument drawn from the unanimity of the large number of believers about the essentials of the Catholic faith. If all doctors who denied that there was danger of sunstroke from the sun shining on the back of the neck were, by that very fact, deprived of their medical degrees, we should find in the unanimity of doctors on the subject no evidence for the truth of the statement. The unanimity in question would be artificial, and we could see the process of its manufacture too clearly to be taken in by it. In the same way, the impressive unanimity of Christian believers loses its im-

pressiveness when we discover that it is artificially produced by the silence or the elimination of those who do not conform to it. If, as in science, we find a real uniformity of opinion amongst those who feel themselves free to think otherwise, that uniformity is very striking evidence, which it would be folly to neglect. Organs of religious authority must avoid the danger of destroying, by an excessive use of discipline against expression of opinions, evidence of this kind which they might otherwise have.

It has already been pointed out that effective dogmatic authority does not presuppose infallibility. In other matters than religion—as, for example, science—we find ourselves under the necessity of submitting ourselves to authority which we do not believe to be infallible. We may readily admit that, if it were true, the doctrine of infallibility would be a convenient one, and would enormously simplify the practice of our submission to the Church. But if, on the other hand, it is not true, the appeal to a miraculously guarded authority will have the disastrous effect of weakening the real strength of authority based on rational grounds.

Since it is often felt that it is in part the insistence of the Church on the infallibility of its authority in matters of doctrine that has been responsible for keeping it rent in a manner inconsistent with our ideals of Christian unity, we may usefully examine the reasons which have been brought forward in favour of the idea of infallibility. What I propose to suggest in criticism of these reasons will, of course, apply to any theory of the infallibility of Councils as well as to the infallibility of the Pope. It is often assumed rather than stated in defences of infallibility that the alternative to it is pure doctrinal anarchy. This we have seen is unfair. An attitude even of complete submission to authority is quite consistent with the belief that the authority in question is capable of error. Submission to authority is logically justifiable if we believe that, on the whole, it is less likely to be wrong in the matters on which we submit to it than is our own independent judgment. This is, of course, the minimum demand we must make of any authority to which we are expected to submit; it is not even suggested that we can postulate no more than this for the authority of the Church.

But, it may be urged, it is just the unique importance of religious belief which makes it different from all other beliefs. In medicine we know that our knowledge is uncertain, but it is only in this life that we can suffer for our ignorance, while our behaviour in matters of religion may affect our well-being for eternity. Can we conceive that God would have left us without a guide which was absolutely certain in a matter of such supreme

importance? This is, in a simple form, the usual *a priori* argument for infallibility. Its weakness is the weakness of any argument which assumes our knowledge of what God would or would not do. This is quite a common assumption in the philosophical writings of past times, even so late as Leibnitz; but, to the modern mind, there is a hint of presumption in the idea that we know so well what God would have done that we can use it as the premiss of an argument. If we imagine ourselves in a prenatal existence, trying from our knowledge of the love and pity of God to deduce the properties of the world into which we were soon to enter, would we have been able to foresee the pain, the disorder, and the ugliness which we have in fact found there?

The supporters of infallibility may appeal to an intuition that the Church is infallible. Even if we do not deny the claim of intuition, unchecked by the critical use of reason, to be treated as an independent source of knowledge, we may well doubt the validity of this intuition. For surely all that intuition can claim to tell us is that a given authority is worthy of our obedience. It is characteristic of the expression of an intuition that it tends to make absolute what is relative, and certain what is probable; or that an authority, which is felt to be valid generally and on the whole, should be said to be infallible.

In the same way we may ask whether the appeal to the words of Scripture can be used as evidence for more than the degree of rightness in the doctrinal pronouncements of the Church which is necessary for our submission, or at most for indefectibility rather than infallibility. In any case, it is obvious that the argument from Scripture is of no value to the outsider, since the infallible authority of Scripture must itself be guaranteed either by the infallible authority of the Church, or, at least, by the same methods as we are trying to show to be inadequate in the case of the Church.

We are left with the evidence for the truth of the doctrine of infallibility from its proved success. We would clearly be arguing in an absurd circle if we maintained that the infallibility of the Church was proved by the fact that its infallible pronouncements have shown themselves to be true, and at the same time we could show no better criterion for which of its past pronouncements had been infallible than that they were the ones which had turned out to be true. Yet this is, in effect, what the defenders of Papal infallibility must do. Any particular Papal pronouncement, which at the time of its promulgation was accepted and believed to be true, but has since been shown to be incorrect, can be explained away by showing that it did not conform to the conditions under which a Papal

pronouncement is infallible. But the same process of explaining away may be applied to nearly every particular pronouncement of the present time. We are left with an authority which we know to be sometimes infallible, but we are totally unable to know when its particular pronouncements are infallible. Thus, in practice, the infallibility of this authority gives no better guarantee of the truth of its pronouncements than it would if it did not possess this property of infallibility. This point is important for the question I propose to discuss later of the possibilities of an alternative conception of authority. At present I wish only to point out that there can be no argument for the truth of the doctrine of infallibility from its proved success. For such an argument it would be necessary that we should have a number of infallible pronouncements in the past which have all proved to be correct, and that there should be clearly defined criteria by which these pronouncements were known at the time of their promulgation to have been infallible. This evidence we have not got. The same criticism may be directed against any proof of conciliar infallibility from its proved success.

We must seek for a conception of authority which is better founded than the theory of infallibility, and which may therefore make a more reasonable claim on the allegiance of the modern man. The conservative instinct of reverence, which makes us fear to suggest changes in existing religious conceptions, need not deter us from this task when we realize the schism, the persecutions, and the bigotry which have been the fruit of that oracular conception of authority which is best exemplified in the theory of infallibility. If we believe in an authority whose pronouncements are on the whole true, which, however, is not infallible, we seem to introduce uncertainty where there was before clear certainty. But a recognized element of uncertainty is better than an illusion of absolute certainty, and if we are led to tolerance of the opinions and loyalties of other people, in place of harshness and bigotry, this will be sheer gain.

This examination of the weakness of the doctrine of infallibility has shown some of the elements which must be reconciled in a more adequate account of authority. We must justify the intuition which leads us to submit ourselves to the authority of the Church in matters in which we feel the light of our own knowledge to be insufficient.

Is not this attitude of submission sufficiently justified by a conception which regards the community as possessed of the wisdom contributed by the experience of the numerous individuals which have composed it? This community is guided

and enlightened by the Holy Spirit. Infallible guidance is found no more for the community than for the individual. We, too, as individuals have some experience and some guidance, so our attitude to the community can never be that of total unquestioning obedience. A community so enriched and so guided is worthy of our submission, but this submission is not a simple thing, as it would be on the theory of infallibility. The adjustment of the claim of the community to be obeyed in matters of faith with that of our own personalities to make their independent judgments is an adjustment of infinite complexity. But is not this complexity so much more like what we find in real life to be our attitude towards other authorities, that it is more likely to be an indication of the true relationship between the individual and the community, than a theory which in effect demands the total surrender of the judgment of the individual as the price of simplicity?

R. H. Thouless.

THE EMBLEM OF THE FIVE WOUNDS OF CHRIST

Art and religious devotion, both being the outward expression of feeling, sway from time to time between different tendencies, the one severe and simple, the other emotional and diffuse. The severe and simple school lacks popularity, and the emotional school is inclined to evaporate, not having enough self-control to carry on its life.

The devotion to the Five Wounds of Christ, which was the outcome of a pathetic emotional view of religion, rose suddenly into popularity in the fifteenth century, and quickly degenerated into a superstition, and then became associated with magic.

The two schools of religious expression have never been able to understand one another. The devout person who finds his strength in a regular controlled life of worship and discipline cannot tolerate the free play of uncontrolled imagination which appeals often to the multitude, and the person to whom suggestion appeals more than fact, and who loves broad dramatic effects, is apt to regard the man of self-restraint as one whose development has been checked, and whose sympathies have been narrowed. Yet, if these two tendencies always exist in the religious life, we must expect a continual movement in one direction or the other.

In the fifteenth century there was a desire to draw out, in dramatic form, the story of our Lord's Passion. The instruments used at the cross—the nails, the pincers, the ladder, the

sponge, the crown of thorns, and others—all find their way into decorative sculpture and carving in churches at this time, and the devotion of the Five Wounds arose. The feeling which prompted it was that which underlay, for example, the remarkable pilgrimage at Bom Jesus in Portugal. The toilsome ascent of some hundreds of steps (made by some on their knees) is flanked by full-sized stations of the Cross: about the centre comes the Crucifixion: above are a series of statues representing the virtues and graces which are the outcome of our Lord's Passion. This contemplation in detail of one symbol after another was the spirit also of the Devotion of the Five Wounds. At the ceremonial of the Adoration of the Cross the arms were uncovered one after another, and prayers offered at each stage.

Five times in His life, says James de Voragine, did our Lord shed His blood, and on the Cross it was shed from His Five Wounds. They came to be known as the Five Fountains, or Wells: the Well of Mercy, the Well of Pity, the Well of Everlasting Life, the Well of Grace, and the Well of Comfort.

The relics of our Lord's Passion had for a long while attracted the attention of the searchers for such things, and the Patriarchs of Jerusalem in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries made presents of drops of His Blood to those who were chosen as the recipients of the highest favour they had to bestow.

In 1247 Robert, Bishop of Nantes and Grand Master of the Temple, forwarded to Henry III. of England a phial containing some of these drops. It was carried in state to Westminster, a sermon was made upon it, and an indulgence offered to all who came to worship there of one hundred and forty days. The foundation of the Abbey of Hayles in Gloucestershire had, however, most to do with the spread of the devotion of the Five Wounds in England. This Abbey was founded in 1246 by the immensely wealthy Richard, Earl of Cornwall. In 1267 the founder, who had been made King of the Romans in 1256, crossed over to Germany, and there married his third wife Beatrice, niece of the Archbishop of Cologne. At the same time his son Edward obtained a portion of the blood reverenced as that of Jesus Christ. This had come to Europe into the possession of William II., Count of Holland, Zealand, and Friesland, authenticated by the seal and guarantee of Jacques Pantaleon, Patriarch of Jerusalem, 1245–61. Edmund, son of Richard, Earl of Cornwall, purchased the relic from Florenz VI., Count of Holland, brought it back to England, and deposited a portion of it at Hayles in 1270, with a great ceremony of inauguration, and afterwards gave the remainder

to the Augustinian House at Ashbridge, which he had founded in 1283. King Richard of the Romans died in 1272, and was buried at Hayles.

Five years later the new shrine for the relic was dedicated—an apse of five radiating chapels with a throne for the relic in the centre, the five chapels symbolizing the Five Wounds. The reliquary became an object of pilgrimage, and the pilgrims brought offerings, and generally wanted mementoes to take away. The Canterbury pilgrims brought away little bells and ampullas of water from Becket's well; those to the shrine of St. James of Compostella, oyster shells: nearly every shrine had its special token. It is quite probable that small crosses illustrating the Five Wounds would reach all parts of England in this way.

Normal theology, however, took little notice of popular developments of this kind. The schoolmen carried on their life of mental discipline, definition, and teaching, no matter what form the fashionable enthusiasm of the day took. Precisely, says Mr. St. Clair Baddeley,* as the Hayles relic was so rapturously admired and adored, so the greatest theologian of the century, St. Thomas Aquinas, expressed his opinion that blood of this nature did not, and could not, exist; for the simple reason that at the moment of Christ's resurrection, the blood that had been shed had perforce been reunited to the resuscitated body (*Summa*, iii. 54). But what could logic do against the attraction of ceremonial and solemn display, not to speak of gifts of money? The merchants, tradesmen, and the husbandmen brought their wives and daughters to make their offerings and devotions at the shrine of Hayles, and thought it great merit to do so; and they had the support generally of the Franciscans, who possessed relics of the same kind, and took the opposite view to the Dominicans, of whom St. Thomas was the representative. These are curious matters to debate about, but differences on such questions are often a matter of temperament; and when the streams of feeling tend to flow towards one bank or other of the channel, any small stone in the middle is soon consolidated into a barrier by the side-wash of both streams.

In the fifteenth century we find the symbol of the Five Wounds in all quarters of the country. It was carved on a font at Elmley Castle in Worcestershire, erected to commemorate the baptism of Arthur Prince of Wales about 1487. Bishop Alcock originally intended it to form part of the device of the seal of Jesus College, Cambridge (of which he was the

* St. Clair Baddeley, "The Holy Blood of Hayles," *Transactions of the Bristol and Gloucester Archæological Society*, vol. xxiii., pp. 276-84.

founder*), but changed his mind afterwards in favour of the three cocks' heads, which were eventually adopted.

Those who went on the Pilgrimage for Grace—a rebellion organized in 1537 to protest against the suppression of the monasteries—" had on their colours the Five Wounds, as they are called, and the representation of a cross with this inscription: *In Hoc Signo Vinces.*" So says Bishop Grindal in a letter to Henry Bullinger in 1570. They wore much the same on their sleeves, with the name of Jesus wrought in the middle. The Barlings' contingent wore in addition the chalice and the Host. One such emblem, consisting of the wounded hands and feet, in the centre the chalice with the Host above it, and the heart depicted on the Host (the monogram I.H.S. being in the chief point) is still in existence, and said to be one of these badges. But it should be pointed out that the device is on a piece of velvet which has been part of a larger one; that it does not precisely correspond with the description of contemporary writers; and that it is most probably the centre ornament of a chasuble, or altar frontal, of which the remainder has been destroyed.†

Far away also from the centres of the Pilgrimage for Grace in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire is a trace of the widespread popularity of the Devotion in the only piece of old glass (that is, of the fifteenth century), now remaining in the vestry of the parish church at Sidmouth in Devon. In this the emblem is depicted with great beauty and elaboration. There is no cross. The Wounds are not the hands and feet pierced, but a long conical stream of red, each with a crown at the top, and the usual titles, though the first, instead of being the Well of Pity, is given as the Well of Wisdom.

The device is found in very many places, amongst others on a brass of Sir John Brooke at Cobham in Kent, dated 1506. In the brass of Bishop Underwood, Suffragan to the Bishop of Norwich, dated 1541, he is represented as on his knees before a cross, in the angles of which are the hands and feet of the Saviour, and in the centre the Heart.‡

Above is the inscription on a scroll: " Vulnere quinque dei sint medecina mea." This throws some light on the popularity and spread of the Devotion. This invocation was used to cure the falling sickness or epilepsy; Bishop Underwood possibly suffered from it himself. John Shaw, Alderman of London, in his will dated 1487, directs that rings of fine gold, " graven with the Well of Pitie, the Well of Mercie, and the

* A. Gray, *Priory of St. Radegund, Cambridge.* Camb. Ant. Soc., 1898.

† Illustration in *Yorkshire Archæological Journal*, vol. xxi., 1911.

‡ The brass itself is missing, with the exception of a coat-of-arms and the inscription above; but the device of it is evident from the matrices.

Well of Everlasting Life, are to be given to sixteen of his friends." Mr. O. M. Dalton, who tells us this*, describes two such rings which are now in the British Museum, one of which was found in Surrey, and the other at Coventry. The latter has on its broad and massive band: "Vulnera quinque dei sunt medecina mea. pia crux et Passio Xti sunt medecina michi Jaspar Melchior Baltazar ananyzapta tetragrammata." The names of the three kings trace the source of the Devotion to Cologne, whenceEdmund, Earl of Cornwall, brought the relic of the Holy Blood to Hayles. Piecesofpaper which had touched the heads of the Three Kings, or Magi, preserved at Cologne, were considered to have po wer to cure epilepsy.

Another version of this charm is: "Jaspar fert myrrham thus Melchoir Balthasar aurum. Haec tria qui secum portabit nomina regum solvitur a morbo Christi pietate caduco." *Morbus caducus* means the falling sickness. The word *ananyzapta*, sometimes associated in this and other charms, is said, in a medical book of the latter part of the fourteenth century, to be a prophylactic against epilepsy, if pronounced in a man's ear when he is fallen in the evil.† Here we have, then, words said to be corruptions of an invocation of the deity, to be used as words of command when the patient was in his fit, and which were easy to be read on a finger-ring, by those who came to his assistance.

Thomas of Elmham,‡ who flourished in the early part of the same century, delighted to juggle with cryptic sentences. He is a medieval puzzle-maker, who introduces himself with his name wound up in one acrostic, and "explicits" with another. He gives the following lines, in which the first letter of each word reads as "Maria" in each line. He places comments, which are necessary to explain the curious expressions he is obliged to introduce to complete his harmony, in footnotes; how otherwise could we understand the allusion to the Blessed Virgin as The Eagle? But he tells us that in these five lines are to be found the "Five Wounds of Christ"—that is, in a cryptogram:

Mentis	Amoena	Rigant	Infirmantis	Ave!
Mortis	amara	rapit	jocundus	Auxiliatrix
Molliat	arva	rosis	justificetur	Amor.
Mites	augmentet	regni	justos	Animando
Mundet	aquas	rarus	imperialis	Avis.

Thus the words form a jangle, no doubt intended to be used as a charm, into which the titles of the "Five Wounds"

* In *Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries*, vol. xxiii., No. 2, 1911.

† See C. W. King, "Talismans and Amulets," *Archæological Journal*, vol. xxvi, p. 225.

‡ *Liber Metricus de Hen. V.*, Rolls Series.

are somewhere incorporated; but the ingredient seems to be so completely dissolved that it cannot be recovered. One "Well," for example, must be "Vita eterna," which possibly may be found in the third or fifth line, but what is not honestly hidden is not worth delving for.

Those who have poured out vials of indignation upon the superstition and the veneration of relics of the pre-Reformation Church, have generally been at a loss to account for it, except by saying that the priests of the time kept the people in ignorance for the sake of their own gain. But this, if true, does not account for the popularity of the relics. We are by no means free to-day from the sufferer from one kind of mental disease or another who will welcome anything, superstitious or otherwise, which even promises a cure for the complaint.

The Churchmen, so far as we have their use of the devotion, kept clear of charm words or objects. We do not find them in the Devotions to the Five Wounds. The well-known "Anima Christi" of Loyola is one of these devotions in the lines:

"Sanguis Christi, inebria me;
Aqua lateris Christi, lava me."

This is the same religious sentiment as Bishop Underwood's "Vulnera quinque dei sint medicina mea," and precisely the same continues in the emotional strain of religion of the present time—in, for example, the old version of Toplady's hymn, "Rock of Ages," and in "O come and mourn." Dr. Pusey edited *The Paradise of the Christian Soul*, in which is a devotion called "Two Rosaries" in honour of Our Lord's Five Sacred Wounds. But perhaps the most remarkable devotional verses to the Five Wounds are very little known; they are written on a finely-illuminated roll of parchment belonging to the latter part of the fifteenth century, about two yards and three-quarters in length. There are seven illuminated and seven outline plates, which are drawings of the wounded hand or Foot or Heart of the Saviour within rays, and a motto encircling each, with the usual legends: "The Well of Mercy," "Pitie," etc., and some devotional verses. Those opposite the third—*i.e.*, the Well of Everlasting Life—are as follows:

Hayle welle and condyte of everlastyng lyffe
Thorow launced so ferre withyn my lorde's syde
The flodys owttraylyng most aromatys
Hayle precius ♥ wounded so large and wyde
Hayle trusty treulove our joy to provide
Hayle porte of glorie wyth paynes all embrued
Ouer all yspryngIyed lyke purpul dew enhued
Hayle swetyst soukate* to us most sanatyfe
O roseat raunsome payd plentiously

* Sweatmeat.

Hayle holsome tryacle* most preserwatyfe
Agayne pestilence eyris† reinginge myscheuosly
Praysnyge and honoure be to thee on hygh
Hayle roddy rede wyne wyth alle thy greuose smert
Drawe from the pype of thy most louynge ♥

This manuscript, which formerly lay at Lomberdale House, was privately printed in 1814 to the extent only of forty copies. Consequently it is not well known. The editor suggests that the author was a monk, but it has the signature of William Billynge, with what is undoubtedly the mark of a wool merchant. These marks follow much the same outlines, and were placed as trade marks on the wool-packs, and sometimes varied by the initials of the owner. But they have their origin in the *Agnus Dei*, the Lamb being chosen in allusion to the fleece. The pole and banner are distorted into an upright mark with streamers, the base, in this case, into a "w" for William. Who, then, was this William Billynge? The family had their origin in Cornwall, but there is a brass inscription preserved in the church at Deddington in Oxfordshire, commemorating William Byllyng, merchant of the staple at Calais, and recording that his son was living at Deddington, a generation later. This William is probably the author of the poem of the Five Wounds, which attempts literary form in the alliteration found in nearly every line, and brings with it a whiff of the censer as its burden.

But it was inevitable that the figure of the symbol should be taken for the reality; the true use of any symbol is expressed by St. John of the Cross in his *Ascent of Mount Carmel*. "Visible things, sometimes," he says, "it is true, help to elevate the soul, but it is when they are instantly forgotten, and the Spirit reposes in God." The representations of the Five Wounds became charms and talismans credited with working cures they could not achieve.

The Abbot of Hayles played the champion for his relic to the end, and when Bishop Latimer assailed it with the rough breeze of his eloquence in a sermon at Bristol, hired "a great Goliath, a subtle Duns man,‡ yea, a great clerk, as he saith," to catch him in his sermons; but Hayles surrendered in the thirty-first year of Henry VIII., and thus a great scandal was removed from the Church.

Devotions of the kind implied in the "Five Wounds" still linger, but few people will find it otherwise than a refreshment and comfort to turn from such tropical growths of prayer to the simpler and more sturdy guidance of the liturgy of the Church of England.

J. Kestell Floyer.

* *I.e.*, balm. † Airs.

‡ The Franciscans were called Dunces by their opponents after one of their leaders, Duns Scotus. Hence the high cap of the "Dunce."

THE USE OF CATHEDRALS

If I use the personal pronoun very often throughout this paper, I hope it will not be attributed to aggressive egoism. My reason is quite a different one. To write as "we" always seems to me, for an ordinary person, absurdly pompous; and, indeed, I have no claim to represent anyone but myself. So I propose to say "I think," "I believe," and so on, because I am only stating my own individual opinion. I am quite aware that I may be often wrong. It is quite likely that, if I live much longer, I may change some of my views through experience or better information. I am not sure whether I am not too old to teach. I hope I am not too old to learn.

To anyone who wishes to study the past history of cathedrals in connection with their usefulness to-day, I would venture to recommend a few books, being far from an exhaustive list. These are: Mr. E. A. Freeman's *Wells;* Archbishop Benson's *The Cathedral: Its Necessary Place in the Life and Work of the Church;* Canon Newbolt's *The Living Power of a Cathedral;* and then, for practical illustration of what such a church may be in the lives of good men, Dr. Liddon's *Walter Kerr Hamilton* and Dr. Gregory's *Autobiography.*

The first thing to be said, and the one thing never to be forgotten, is that cathedral churches were built, and still exist, not for any bishops, or chapters, or choirs, or musicians whatever, but for the glory of God. They are to be the expression, in the most complete, most exquisite, most devoted achievement of which man is capable, of the reverence of humanity for the Divine, of the offering of body, soul, and spirit to the Almighty Father, to His only Son our Lord, to the Spirit of Sanctification, the ever blessed and adorable Trinity. That is the thought which we whose lot is cast in the great churches should never allow to sink into the background of our minds. That is the thought which should inspire all our work and all our prayers. If only that thought can be burnt into our hearts by the fire of the Holy Spirit, there will no longer be complaints of uselessness or dreariness or formalism or theatricalism. Men will see from our worship that these glorious buildings are used day by day continually as the homes of God on earth. So we shall not fear criticism over our work or our aims, individual or corporate, whether it be intelligent or malicious. Rather we shall learn something from all that is said against us, because we learn most of all from our daily converse with God.

The motto of all who serve in cathedral churches must be, "Lord, I have loved the habitation of Thy House—because it is Thine—and the place where Thine honour dwelleth."

I should like to quote some words I wrote a few years ago when it was my privilege to edit the *Autobiography of Dr. Gregory*, Dean of S. Paul's. (I wish everyone who has to do with cathedrals would read what Dr. Gregory wrote; but I am sorry to find that the book is out of print.) I had noted the wonderful record of Dr. Gregory's attendances at morning and evening prayers every week-day throughout the year, and I added: "Such a record of attendance as the Dean's is but one of the many proofs that he was indeed at home at S. Paul's. He felt very keenly that the work of a cathedral, rightly done, was enough to occupy any man. Archbishop Benson, in his book *The Cathedral*, had set out the need of such single-hearted devotion, and insisted that not only should the 'universal old perpetual or "major residence" of two-thirds of the year at least,' be restored, but that the *majores personæ*, Precentor, Chancellor, Sub-Dean, Treasurer, or the like, with the Archdeacon, should be the residentiaries, and charged with the definite duties of their stalls, as had indeed been the practice even in the eighteenth century, 'the Chancellor lecturing from time to time, and the Precentor invariably ordering the service.'* This was the view also of Dr. Gregory. He knew that it was difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a consistent policy in regard to the functions of a cathedral from those who were only occasionally resident, and he knew that those who were compelled by their duties to reside and to attend certain services, were not likely to do more than was actually required of them if their superior officers were content to give a minimum of residence and worship."

It is the superior officials of the Church who must set the example. In order to do so they must run counter to a persistent tendency of to-day. Canon Newbolt has said very truly that "we are living to see the growth of a grudging spirit towards God in the matter of the time which we devote to His service," but "it is a sorry thing to worship God with a grudging heart, to be for ever asking *when will the new moon be gone, that we may sell corn, and the Sabbath that we may set forth wheat?* It is quite possible that God may be asking a tithe of our time as well as a tithe of our money."

There has never been a better Dean in recent times than was Henry Charles Beeching at Norwich—a true scholar, a wise

* This, of course, would only apply where the Precentor was a Major Canon, or where the statutes give him this power. The Organist must certainly not be ignored (nor even the Dean).

and good man. He was once asked to set down a motto for a day. He wrote:

> For every man hath business and desire
> Such as it is; and for mine own poor part,
> Look you, I'll go pray.

It is right that some at least of the officers of the cathedral should also work outside, as their office calls them and as their Bishop may direct; but we who serve in cathedrals should be, first of all, men of prayer. There is no work for God that may not spring from that.

It must be our care to see that no possible opportunity for prayer for any person at any time is lost by our neglect. Thus our first duty is to see that the daily services of worship are frequent, reverent, and at suitable times. To most cathedral cities there are constant visitors; in almost all there is a devoted body of habitual worshippers. Thus there should be a daily celebration of the Holy Communion, at which may be offered intercession for every district in the diocese in turn, as well as for special objects and special needs. Continually among the familiar faces we find newcomers, folk passing through on a journey, in sorrow, at some particular crisis of life, drawing nigh to God. These value more than we can guess their communion with us. The expression of man's dedication of the cathedrals is the perpetual round of divine worship. Canon Newbolt has quoted a saying of Bishop Harvey Goodwin, when he was himself a Dean: "The principal feature of a cathedral is the maintenance of a daily service on a grand scale." That was the aim of those who built these splendid fabrics: it is the object with which those who love them seek to preserve their system in an age which (often very ineffectively) seeks efficiency, and rarely looks beyond a practical utilitarianism. We whose work lies in the cathedrals believe that it is our duty as well as our privilege to show forth the glory of God, to reflect His majesty, however dimly and in enigma, in the most beautiful, most stately, and most complete manner that lies within our power. And we thus act, not for ourselves, but on behalf of all our brethren of the whole Body of Christ on earth. With all our hearts we echo the words of Dean Church: "It is not for ourselves, it is for the whole body of those for whom Christ died and rose again that, for their sakes and in their name, we in a place like this offer to Him of our best, that we adorn His house with majesty and beauty, that we fill its courts with glorious music. For them, in such places as this, we understand that we are bound to meet their longings for what is beautiful."

The worship of a cathedral must be beautiful no less than it must be constant. It is for this reason that I for one so greatly

regret that in some places it seems for the present necessary to restrict in number the musical services which for centuries have been the characteristic offering of our English cathedrals. The difficulties of their continuance are well known: the diminishing funds of the Chapters; the necessarily rising salaries of the musicians and others whose profession it is to serve in this way; the increase of work which is thrown upon the clerical staffs of the cathedrals. But I do most firmly believe that what is worth doing here, as everywhere else, is worth doing well; and so it must be done if we never forget that it is done for Him for Whom no devotion can be too deep and no homage too high.

Now a word as to those on whom the responsibility for the maintenance of cathedral worship—and on many of them also the responsibility for the maintenance of the fabric—depends. As is well known, there are several varieties of cathedral foundations, and in some of the newest of them the Bishop acts as Dean. I believe that experience in most cases has shown that this places on the Bishop an almost impossible burden. He cannot really oversee the whole diocese and at the same time deal with the minute points of cathedral work. Sooner or later he must delegate his functions. That means that a cathedral really does need a Dean. Nowadays Chapters—governing Chapters, that is—are usually quite small in numbers. And the powers of Deans in different cathedrals are very different. Into details there is no need or space to enter here. But part, though only a very small (and that the last) part, of what Archbishop Benson quoted from Roderic of Zamora (through Van Espen) is still true:

"A Dean succeeds to the government of a Chapter—say, rather, to the guiding of an untameable beast. It is hard and difficult to govern a small house, but great Chapters are so much the worse, because there are as many opinions as there are individuals. If a Dean be charmed with the dignity of his office, let him fear its burdens; let him fear its perils. It is no easy task to recount them."

The burdens cannot be lightened by combining the offices of Bishop and Dean. Said Archbishop Benson, "Let us trust we have heard the last of such proposals."

I cannot go into detail as to the work of each of the Chapters. It must vary according to circumstances, statutes, and duties. I will content myself rather with the spirit in which each should work. We have all heard, no doubt, in fiction or fact, of domineering Deans, of provoking Precentors, of Organists old-fashioned and out of sympathy with modern art. Even Canons may have been cantankerous at times. The only way

to cure such ills is for each one to take as his motto for all his work some such words as those of Canon Newbolt:

"Let me offer to God and to His spiritual service the powers which are mine in the endowment of my human nature. Let me put at His disposal all that my education has done for me or brought to me. Let me give Him my experience and the result of any success, or the warnings of any failure which life has given me. God, knowing my past, and knowing my future, and with His eye on the work which I am able to do in the present, has put me here: *Spartam nactus es, hanc exorna.*"

I hope I have not spent too long a time on generalities. But I am convinced that it is on such generalities—or, in other words, in the spirit in which our work is done—that the usefulness of cathedrals depends. Important though the use of them in detail is, it is more important still that everything that is done in them, whatever it is, should be done by everyone, Bishop to verger, for the glory of God. Briefly, then, as to the work to be done in cathedrals:

1. The music. The characteristic offering of the cathedral to God is beautiful music. This must be subordinated always to, or rather governed by, the idea of worship. The organist does not play, the minor canon intone, the choir sing, for effect, but for devotion. And what is devoted is the best power of each. Until quite recently, I believe that practically every eminent English musician had been trained in a cathedral. It is of paramount importance that these schools of music, with their local differences and their individual leadership, should continue. Church music has rightly been a profession, and so it should remain. And it should be a properly paid profession.

A sub-head, as it were, to this is the education of the children of the choir. There are great difficulties about this nowadays, and not all cathedrals can support a separate school. I see no reason at all why the choristers should not attend a good local secondary school, and either live with their parents or board with the Precentor or some musical official of the Church.

2. Preaching and lecturing are proper functions of the cathedral body. Lectures on subjects of religious interest—historical, social, musical, educational—should fall within the functions and the capacity of the members of the cathedral body to deliver. Preaching should be especially cultivated. Those who attend cathedral services expect the preachers to take very special pains to instruct and advise them. Happily for us all, men have ceased to think of cathedrals as comfortable

refuges for quiet clergymen, and their pulpits as reserved for what Herbert Losinga, the great Bishop-builder of Norwich, called "the drivelling opinions of advancing age." Nor is it old men alone who are capable of such weakness.

3. Special services for diocesan purposes, for guilds and societies, should constantly be organized: the difficulty here is very generally a geographical one, which modern systems of transport may diminish. And, wherever it is possible, each diocesan society should find in some special way, perhaps in some special part of it, the cathedral to be its spiritual home.

4. This leads to a word about the Bishop's relation to the cathedral. It must never be forgotten that it is his church, not merely the Chapter's, or the city's, or the nation's. What his duties in it, his powers in regard to it, the closeness of his connection with it, may be, must depend upon where he lives, what he has to do, what the cathedral statutes are, and other things too. When the commission of 1854 asked the question, "What are the rights of the Bishop with respect to the cathedral church?" the Chapter of Winchester replied, "None, except as visitor." I am no believer in a cast-iron system. Local varieties are the very breath of a living church. To these Bishops and Chapters should adapt themselves. They should not try to bend or break them to their will. I have known a Bishop who attended the daily services every day when he was at home. I have known a Bishop whose attendances during the year were so few that it was thought better not to keep a record of them. But both, mind you, were very good Bishops; it was the circumstances which differed.

5. It is of great importance, if the English Church is not to lose its ancient reputation for the instructed intelligence of its clergy—and it is in great danger of losing it—that the cathedrals should be places of learning. This depends on the Crown and the Lord Chancellor and the Bishop, in whose hands appointments rest. The cathedral Chapter should not be filled with men who are worked to the bone outside the cathedral or in its own material interests. There should be a home of leisure for men of learning, who shall not only pray, but study. If they are not worried by committees, they will have time for both.

6. The clergy are likely, but the public are not at all likely, to forget that the cathedrals are the greatest examples of English art which we possess. It is the duty of those who guard them to see that everyone who enters them has the opportunity of studying the glorious architecture which they exhibit. For this reason I am utterly opposed to the closing of any part to any human being. What man has built, man has a right to

see. Let it never be forgotten that the great architecture of our cathedrals is a lesson in humility as well as in prayer. They were set up in the very contrast to every thought of man's glory or human praise. The greatest is achieved by innumerable acts of self-effacement. The splendour which all see is the result of countless pieces of craftsmanship which no man sees. Again and again you find that detail, decoration, a thought of beauty embodying itself in stone or glass, is set where men do not look for it, where in long centuries no one will praise it. It was set there because no work of man's highest can be great enough to show his humility and love. In our cathedrals the art which made and enriches them, the history which has passed in them, is all consecrated to God. That is why—and not only because he has a right to architecture as well as music—everyone should be allowed to see them freely. But do not let it be thought that this is to turn a cathedral into a museum. I am quite sure that the services of a good verger—and I have experience of very good ones—as well as of a member of the Chapters, are a real, even a necessary, help to a great number of visitors. To let people wander aimlessly about without any effort to direct them to what is good in art, which is of historic interest or of beauty, is to turn the cathedrals into museums. To teach people what is good in architecture is just as valuable as it is to teach them what is good in music, or painting, or literature. A trained guide is indispensable in a cathedral. But he must be one who has the same devotion to God that the builders had, that the worshippers have, that those who live and work in the cathedrals must all have, if they are not to be unworthy of their place.

7. There is the thorny point of fees. No one wishes more than I do to throw all open. But experience proves in some cathedrals that irreparable damage is done where there is no control, and treasurers are insistent in some cases that an entire abolition of fees is impossible. The subject cannot be settled in a paper so brief as this. I must be content to ask everyone who can to read the most admirable sections on the subject in the Primary Charge of the Bishop of Peterborough (S.P.C.K., 1921).

W. H. Hutton.

THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT

Of all the tools at the disposal of the student of Christian theology none is so valuable as the text of the New Testament. There we get nearer to Our Lord's mind than anywhere else. All the efforts of destructive criticism in the nineteenth century

have not availed to destroy the truth of this. The documents included within the New Testament are on the whole what they profess to be, communications from those who consorted with Jesus the Messiah, or were in close touch with those who did. This is strictly true of the authors' autographs only, but even if we had these, there would still be endless scope for the interpretation of writings preserved in an ancient language which we can only imperfectly comprehend.* Since, however, the autographs are irretrievably lost, scholars have had to face the preliminary task of reconstructing the text of these works from multitudinous copies of various date, locality, and language. It is with the actual state of the textual problem that the present paper proposes briefly to deal.

The task of textual criticism demands special qualifications. First and foremost, perhaps, comes a thorough knowledge of the language or languages in which the documents under consideration are written. A rigorous training in classical Greek is an immense advantage as a preliminary to the study of the Greek of the later period. It is not without significance that our leading authorities in New Testament Greek—men like Blass, J. H. Moulton, and G. Milligan—were all thoroughly drilled in classics before they came to the special study of the New Testament documents. They thus acquired power to observe, explain, and classify the linguistic phenomena of the later period, which is now more than ever a subject in itself, since the immense accessions of non-literary documents from Egypt have shed such light upon it. Much the same is true of the later Latin, as related to that of the classical period. And no one will now deny that a knowledge of Aramaic and Hebrew is of immense service for the study of the Gospels in particular. But one man can hardly hope to compass all this knowledge. We see this, for instance, when the Hebrew and Aramaic expert Wellhausen ventures to touch on Greek matters.

But our textual critic must also have an acquaintance with ancient documents through personal handling and study of them. He must be something of a palæographer. Long converse with the manuscripts themselves gives one an insight into their pathology. Only thus can you really get to know the various kinds of errors that occur. A scholar, unacquainted with documents in this personal way, may suggest to the uninitiated reader possibilities of corruption which the experienced student of MSS. will repudiate. Errors are either acci-

* Scholars who are also pastors will, however, readily acknowledge that simple-minded, prayerful Christians, ignorant of any language but their own, sometimes apprehend truths hidden from the learned. Cf. J. E. B. Mayor's *Spain, Portugal, the Bible* (Cambridge, 1892), p. xliv.

dental or deliberate: they may even be both, accidental on the part of one scribe, deliberate on the part of a later scribe who endeavours to patch up the error. As time goes on more and more "corrections" are due to this latter cause, and if a document full of such be our only authority, a complete restoration of the original text is impossible. We still want a comprehensive handbook of tables of errors that have occurred, with a statement of the documents (dated and localized, if possible) in which they occur. We shall then perhaps be rid of much haphazard conjecture.

There is a further quality which is really indispensable, and that is common sense or judgment. The critic must know the writings on which he is at work in the most thorough manner. He must have entered, as it were, into the soul of the author, and must comprehend the whole tenor of his thought, as well as the details of his vocabulary and grammar. He will thus and thus only have the instinct to reject the proposals of less thoughtful readers. He must also have the power, which can only be got by a good knowledge of Church history and dogma, to discern, when face to face with a number of variants revealing a variety, say, of theological conception, which is most likely to be the original and the motive of the subsequent alterations, when, where, and in what interests they were made. Very often the considerations on either side will be very nicely balanced. And it is here perhaps that the value of independent treatment by various scholars is most evident. Textual critics are also human beings, with defects and prejudices, each with his own particular way of looking at things. Thus a consensus of opinion among the scholars highest in repute in the world of learning may more safely be taken on trust by the body of students than the *ipse dixit* of any one of them. It is, nevertheless, possible that one may be right in his conclusions, and all his contemporaries wrong.* Time alone can show, and it is here that the study of the greatest critics of the past is so helpful for the strengthening of one's own powers. A student who reads through Porson's *Letters to Travis*, for instance, will understand what I mean: it is not worth while to study any but the greatest of the older critics.

The year 1881 saw the publication of Westcott and Hort's great edition. It was greater than any of its predecessors, and in my opinion is greater than any of its successors. The reasons are not far to seek. The two editors both had the finest

* I feel certain that the future will decide that Rom. xvi. 23 should be rendered, "Quartus *his* brother," and Eph. i. 15 (the shorter reading being the true one), "and that which is *among* all the saints;" yet many living scholars refuse one or both of these renderings.

classical training in the world, and had superimposed upon this an intensive study of theology, which was combined with the cure of souls. The advantages they had were unsurpassed. The publication of the correspondence of the two scholars concerning their great task will probably enable one to assess the relative value of the contribution each made to the common task. Into their workshop I have had only one glimpse. The paragraph of the Introduction (§ 220) touching the Latin translation of Irenæus, in which the authors decide in favour of the fourth century as its date, is based on a careful independent investigation of the question by Hort. His MS. I have been privileged to copy out for press, and it will be published about Easter, 1922.* An investigation of twenty-one quarto pages lies behind that one paragraph. It was in this spirit that their great work was conducted, and we may be quite certain that the command to " prove all things " was obeyed throughout.

But if it be the case that no better text than that of Westcott and Hort has yet been published, the reader may well ask whether no progress at all has been made during the last forty years. The answer is that great progress has been made in our knowledge of the foundations of the text, though this knowledge has not yet been made available in any published text. As regards Greek MSS., the discovery of the two new uncials, W (Washington Gospels, 5th century) and Θ (Koridethi Gospels, 8th century), as well as the much fuller knowledge of the minuscules due to Lake, Hoskier, Charles,† Von Soden's collaborators and others, deserves the fullest recognition. The most important discovery of all is unquestionably that of the Sinaitic (Lewis) Syriac Gospels, which appear to represent a Greek MS. of date about A.D. 200. The invaluable work of Horner has put us in possession of the Bohairic and Sahidic evidence for the text of the New Testament.‡ Dr. Sanday's great essay on the fragmentary codex Bobiensis (k) of the Old-Latin Gospels has made a classification of Old-Latin MSS. possible, and in the great Vulgate of Wordsworth and White§ we are provided with that indispensable norm by which all Latin texts are to be judged, and along with it they have given us what is practically an up-to-date Sabatier for Acts, Romans, and First Corinthians. These are among the valuable materials which the interval has brought us, and for them we are deeply grateful. Progress has been made in other directions also.

* As part of the *Novum Testamentum S. Irenæi* (Old-Latin Biblical Texts, No. VII) by Dr. Sanday and collaborators.

† For the Apocalypse (*International Critical Commentary*).

‡ Of the Sahidic version, Acts, Catholic Epistles, and Apocalypse are as yet unpublished.

§ Of which First Corinthians is about to appear.

Two of the most important factors in the textual criticism of the Gospels have come to be better known and realized. One of these is the bearing of the synoptic problem on the text. It has come to be widely held that Mark is the earliest of our Gospels, and that Mark was a leading authority for "Matthew" and Luke. At the same time it has become clear that, as "Matthew" was the most frequently read and the best known of the Gospels, there was a tendency to harmonize the text of parallel passages in Mark and Luke to the Matthæan form. Further, it is now generally held that "Matthew" and Luke employed a second common document called Q (*Quelle*, source) in the compilation of their Gospels, and that there is a tendency, corresponding to that we have already mentioned, to harmonize the Lukan form of text with the Matthæan, where parallel passages are common to these Gospels, though wanting in Mark. It is clearly, therefore, unsafe to constitute the text of any one Gospel without constant reference to the others. Closely related to this is a second factor which Von Soden and Vogels have brought into prominence, the influence of Tatian's *Diatessaron* on the Gospel text.

When Westcott and Hort wrote, little was known of Tatian's *Diatessaron*. Even yet we cannot say much in detail about its original text. But we possess two copies of it in Arabic. These Arabic copies are translations from Syriac, but the Gospel quotations in this Syriac were given in the Peshitta (Vulgate) Syriac text, which is now known to belong to the early part of the fifth century, and to be a revision of an earlier Syriac text, made by Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa. This is one of the greatest points gained since 1881.* Clearly Tatian's *Diatessaron* must have given the Gospel quotations in an earlier form of text altogether than the Peshitta is, but of this earlier form of text we possess only a few fragments in an Armenian translation of Ephraem the Syrian's commentary on the *Diatessaron*. It was probably in Rome that Tatian took a copy of the Gospels in a "Western" Greek text, and wove from them his harmony—in Greek in the first instance—and then translated it into Syriac. How far the Greek form had vogue is one of the vexed questions of the hour. From the uncritical point of view of the early Church, it must have been an immense advantage to have in one volume all the contents of the Gospels, with little or no repetition of narrative. Tatian was an Encratite, and in consequence his name was none too greatly loved by Catholics, but the Church has shown its willingness to use valuable works by schismatics† and even heretics, if the names of their authors are

* Due to Burkitt.

† The case of the *Rules* of Tyconius the Donatist, highly appreciated by Augustine and Cassiodorus, occurs to one. They did not suppress the name.

suppressed, and it may be that Tatian did not put his name to the work. The existence of various Latin MSS. of which the *Codex Fuldensis* of Bishop Victor of Capua (sixth century) is the oldest* shows that the *Diatessaron* had some vogue in the West, for it is a Latin copy of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, which can only have been translated from a Greek original. Yet here again we are balked in our desire to recover the exact text of Tatian, for Victor had the Vulgate Latin text substituted throughout. The result is that at the moment we know Tatian's arrangement perfectly, but his text only in a few passages.

Yet it is to this seriously altered Tatian that Von Soden assigns a rôle of the utmost importance. Every citation which varies from the Gospel text that he has reconstructed from three ancient recensions is explained by the use of the *Diatessaron*, on the assumption that the Arabic form we have represents not only the arrangement, but the text of the original production of Tatian. The tendency of such a view, as of his view of three recensions, is to pay too much respect to the Syrian (Antiochian, Constantinopolitan) type of text, from which, under the guidance of Bentley, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, we believed we had been emancipated. The result is that Von Soden's text is retrograde. I am willing, as I have said, to admit the influence of Tatian's *Diatessaron* in its original form, on such a text as we get in *Codex Bezæ*, for example, but can go no farther with Von Soden. No later research has in my opinion dethroned B and ℵ from their supreme position among Greek Gospel MSS. The numerous papyrus fragments found in Egypt have served to confirm many of their readings. And if it be replied that this is natural, because all these documents are Egyptian, to this reply I have no objection to make. When the critics ask why Egypt should have preserved a better text than other provinces, the answer is not difficult for the student of Roman history. Egypt was a province apart, the personal property of the Emperor, isolated from others in a remarkable degree. To external influences it was to a great extent impervious. Further, there was a tradition in Egypt of accurate study and preservation of books such as one cannot parallel in any other part of the Roman Empire.

Yet I should not for a moment decry the importance of what is known as the " Western " text. We know a good deal more about this text than it was possible for Westcott and Hort to know. We can go so far as to say that prior to Origen's time, the first half of the third century, no evidence of the existence of the B and ℵ type of text can be produced, and that

* It is to Vogels that we owe most in the study of Latin copies of the *Diatessaron*.

in every locality of which we have knowledge, the " Western " text is in possession. This is true even of Alexandria itself, for we now know that Clement of Alexandria used a Western text, and we have long known that Origen also was acquainted with it. The universal prevalence of the Western text in early days is no doubt due to the fact that it circulated from Rome itself. Whatever be its origin and value, it is obvious that the agreement of k (Bobiensis) of the Old Latin, representing the Gospels as read in Carthage, say about A.D. 220, and the Old Syriac, representing the Gospels as read in Syrian Antioch, say about A.D. 200, represents a very old reading, the merits of which will have to be carefully set over against a rival reading of the Neutral class. With regard to this Neutral class, it ought to be added that it was favoured by Jerome. Jerome, to whom the learning of Origen, Eusebius, and others was accessible to an extent only to be dreamt of now, deliberately chose a MS. like ℵ to revise the Greek underlying the Old-Latin version in the Gospels, as Wordsworth and White have shown, and I am ready to agree with the Roman Catholic scholar Vogels that, of all the readings of the Vulgate, most significance attaches to those from which all the Old-Latin authorities differ.

Textual problems are, of course, not confined to the Gospels. In the Acts of the Apostles the " Western " variants are more remarkable than anywhere else. It will be an immense advantage to have in Dr. Ropes's forthcoming part of Foakes Jackson and Lake's comprehensive work the Neutral and the Western texts printed in full on opposite pages. The question of the genesis of these two texts cannot even yet be said to be absolutely settled. So far as documents are concerned the chief accessions of the last decade are two MSS. of the Sahidic version, one assigned to the fourth century, published in Dr. Budge's *Coptic Biblical Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (London, 1912), and the other, of the same date (unfortunately without translation), in Dr. Wessely's 1913 paper in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Vienna Academy.

For the Pauline Epistles also the chief accession is Horner's edition of the Sahidic (1920). The Freer MS. of the Greek, published in 1918, is so meagre as to be almost valueless. The Pelagian text, which turns out to be an Old-Latin form parallel to *d*, *g*, and *r*, will be published by the present writer in 1923. It is probable that in it we have the form of the Epistles read in our own islands two and even three centuries before the coming of St. Augustine of Canterbury. For this reason the interest attaching to it is great, even though it do nothing towards the restoration of the original Greek text. Of the much earlier Marcionite text we have now Harnack's restoration (1921)

to set over against the well-known work of Zahn. Finally, it is now perhaps clearer than before that the Epistle to the Romans circulated also in a briefer edition, with all allusions to Rome and Roman Christians expunged.* This shorter form is no doubt secondary, and due to a sense of its value for Christians in general. In the textual criticism of the Epistle to the Hebrews we have an interesting aid in a recent (1920) article of Harnack, which starts from a study of the Vulgate text. He classifies the Old-Latin forms of text for the epistle, and relates the Vulgate to them. He had previously (1916) done a neat piece of work on the Catholic Epistles. Taking the Wordsworth-White text of the Vulgate, he retranslated it into the Greek it may be taken to represent, and furnished this text with a critical apparatus. The result is to assign to the Vulgate text an importance which Protestants at least have never been inclined to accord to it. Under leadership like Harnack's it may be hoped that many fresh recruits will rally to the standard of students of the Latin Bible, too long despised and neglected by superior persons.

The Apocalypse is in a more fortunate position than any other part of the New Testament. It is hardly too much to say that Dr. Charles (in his great edition, 1920) and Mr. Hoskier have collated all the Greek MSS. of the Apocalypse known to exist. The apparatus furnished by Dr. Charles and the forthcoming work of Mr. Hoskier† will give textual scholars much to exercise their brains upon for generations. Bousset in his later edition of the Apocalypse (1906) has made a careful classification of all the authorities for the text known to him. A problem faces us in this book, which is rather different from what we find elsewhere. It appears that the originally rather uncultivated diction of the book has been subjected to a fairly continuous revision in the interests of a more literary style. More can be done than has yet been done in restoring this less literary form.

From the remarks that have preceded the reader will have realized that the period since Westcott and Hort has been distinguished rather by the accession of new materials than by the actual restoration of the true text in passages which baffled them. During the forty years much has appeared, diverse in character and importance. If I were asked to name what appeared to me the most satisfying of all the directions in which the history of the New Testament text has been pursued, I should name the correlation of Old-Latin Biblical MSS. with

* I cannot countenance for a moment the view that the last two chapters or any part of them are a letter to Ephesus.

† *Cf.* meantime his work *Concerning the Date of the Bohairic Version* (London, 1911).

patristic quotations. Since Sanday proved that k (Codex Bobiensis) is the text used by St. Cyprian, a number of such identifications have been made. It has been shown that a text identical with *a* (Codex Vercellensis), as regards the Gospel of St. Luke, was used on occasion by St. Jerome and that Lucifer of Cagliari used *a*'s type of text for St. John; that *gig* (Codex Gigas at Stockholm) of Acts is of the type used by Lucifer, Ambrosiaster, Niceta of Remesiana, and sometimes Jerome; that *r* of the Pauline Epistles is the Augustinian Text, while *d* represents Lucifer's; that *m* (the Speculum) in the Catholic Epistles is the same text as that used by Priscillian (or Instantius); finally, Dr. Vogels has made a nearly exhaustive examination of Latin codices of the Apocalypse and patristic quotations from the same book. These equations are the result of better editing of patristic texts, or the discovery of new texts, and would seem to promise that new critical editions of the texts of the Latin Fathers will lead to further identifications in the future.

A. Souter.

A PLEA FOR AN ANGLICAN BREVIARY

The Morning and Evening Prayer of the English Church has given the laity a useful Breviary, so far as I know the only one which has survived for public worship. In the Roman Catholic Church the Breviary and the hour offices are for religious and priests; there are no public Matins and Evensong, the latter being now supplied by the modern service of "Benediction."

The medieval Church was fecund in devotional development along different lines in different localities, especially in the West. First came the Mass, with its unvarying canon enriched by a variety of local usages, prayers, and ritual acts. This was undoubtedly a development of the primitive Eucharistic service, with its sharp distinction between catechumens and penitents and baptized Christians enjoying full privileges. The Canon of the Western Mass is in itself a Breviary in the sense that it is a reduction and adaptation of longer and fuller prayers. Ancient as it is, it bears the stamp of a certain modernity, especially as compared with the Greek and Oriental rites. The story of the Breviary—its development from the Greek *euchologia;* its varying forms; the condensation of its numerous hour services into Matins, Lauds, Evensong; the introduction of its fine hymnary—belongs to a date later than that of the Mass, but is equally fascinating. Combined with the study of the Breviary is that of the calendar, with its many saints' days and its com-

plicated rules for the conduct of services on principal double, double, and semi-double feast days. This makes the Breviary tedious and difficult to read, and it is greatly neglected by the majority of the priesthood of the Church of England, comparatively few of whom, we fear, know what it contains, and not many have even read the Canon of the Mass. Yet it is surprising how little even a strict Evangelical could find to object to in either Mass or Breviary, especially if the legends of some saints are omitted. The two venerable lists of the saints in the canon rather serve to recall the fact that they are also present in heaven in the constant celestial service of which the Eucharist is a counterpart, than to suggest any superstitious notions as to the efficacy of their intercessions at the throne of grace. Our Communion Office is a marvellously skilful adaptation of the Mass, and even more ingenuity was shown in evolving our Morning and Evening Prayer from the Breviary. The basic principle at work was to make the services entirely Scriptural, and as simple and intelligible as possible. The name of every saint outside Scripture was struck out, every Collect which alluded to his legendary sufferings or labours was altered, and nothing was allowed to appear in the new service books which was not in the Bible. Even the Apocrypha was banned, though the *Benedicite omnia opera*, the Song of the Three Children, and two verses from Tobit in the Offertory were allowed to survive, and a little was retained in the Lectionary. The *Te Deum* and the hymn of St. Notkar, "Man that is born of a woman," in the Burial Service, are almost unique as non-Scriptural additions to the Psalms of the English Church. Even the Creeds are half apologized for in the Articles, and it is declared that they are to be "thoroughly received and believed; for that they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." If the Prayer-Book is Catholic in form, it is severely Protestant in its adherence to the Bible, and the Bible only.

The highest commendation which our forefathers could give to a service was that it was thoroughly Scriptural. At the present time it is a subject for serious enquiry whether this is a commendation or not.

There is a tendency, especially in America, among men who are friends, and not enemies, of the Christian Church to ask whether the system of teaching the Christian religion entirely from the Bible is not outworn and no longer serviceable. This is the logical outcome of the objections which in the youth of some elderly people used to be raised against insisting on children learning not only the not very edifying, but most interesting, Old Testament stories, but also the dullest

conceivable historical (*si tandem* historical) data in the Bible—

> ". . . Of lines of Jewish kings.
> How many notes a sackbut hath,
> And whether shawms have strings."

The New Testament objectors ask, and especially the Gospel, may lay down all the principles of good citizenship; but does what is known of the life of Jesus lay down any practical rule for working out the complex problems of modern life?

And it is not uncommon nowadays to hear the meaning of Scripture so distorted in order to make it support some generally accepted truth that many a thoughtful man exclaims: "If the Bible can be forced to mean that it can mean anything." To take but a single instance, I heard a professor of a first-rate University, a man widely known for his writings, explain that the constitution of Israel was that of a democracy in which the rights of the individual were studiously respected, and that the word *melech* meant, not a king, but an adviser, and so on *ad infinitum*, all tending to show that in Israel no one had privileges and everybody a vote, and that King Solomon's authority resembled that of President Wilson, but was exercised in a less arbitrary manner. Had he gone much farther, I almost expected to hear that Naboth's death was entirely justified because he had inherited a vineyard, and that Ahab was a pioneer of prohibition because he wanted to turn it into a garden of herbs. Frankly, it seems more honest to say that the Bible has no message for the present day than to bring it up to date by a perversion of allegorism which is alike profane and absurd. No sensible person, however, denies that the Old and New Testament have their messages to the present day; but practically all are agreed that they cannot be taken in the sense in which our forefathers received them. They, especially in Reformation days, held generally that all truth was contained within the covers of the Bible, and that nothing was really sacred that lay outside. For example, the framers of the Prayer-Book considered that St. Bartholomew, of whom all we know is that he may or may not have been Nathanael, was a proper saint to be honoured because he was an Apostle and is mentioned in Holy Scripture; but that St. Augustine, whose teaching coloured the whole theology of Protestantism, though we know the facts of his life from the cradle to the grave, though his conversion is one of the triumphs of the Gospel, deserves no such honour because he is not Biblical.

The reason for this is plain, as was the demand for a purely Scriptural worship, which justified the Puritan objection to the Church of England devoting practically the whole of

October and November to the daily reading of some of the finest parts of the Apocrypha. "The Bible is the religion of Protestants" was their watchword, as it was with the Churchman Chillingworth; and it was the Bible regarded not as literature—admiration of the literary beauties of Scripture is very modern indeed—but as a priceless repository of the truth. In the present day the great fault seems to be that men think that the faith can best be conserved by pretending to believe. Thus on the one hand we find people still demanding that their worship must be above all things Biblical because they think they are Protestants, and on the other side that the service must be medieval because they claim the title of Catholic. But those who do not seriously believe that the saints are wonder-working beings in the heavenly hierarchy, or that there is no truth not implicit at least in an inspired Bible, are not Catholics in the medieval nor Protestants in the Reformation sense of the words. In such people coldness in religion is not to be warmed into vitality by superstition or unmeaning Scripturalism.

One has only to enter a Protestant church to discover that Scriptural worship as such has but little attraction. The organist, the quartette, the soloists are all unscriptural, and hired not without expense. The sermon is as a rule an eloquent speech on topics of the day to which a text from Scripture has by courtesy been prefixed. The prayer is a short and probably eloquent address to the Unseen; two extracts from Scripture, brief, and selected by the taste of the preacher, form pleasing interludes between hymns and anthems.

In the Anglican churches services are more devotional, but are they more edifying? Do we not hear constant complaints against Matins and Evensong from the advanced clergy; and from those who call themselves truly Catholic an insistent demand to substitute the modern service of Benediction for the Evening Prayer? Every priest is bound to recite his daily office; and if he does so, does he not find the lessons selected from the lectionary frequently inapt and monotonous? Admirable as the Prayer-Book is, does he not need a more varied manual of devotion?

And what is the general result of this so-called Scriptural worship on priest and people, and especially on the young? Is it not to drive them to suppose that everything to do with religion happened a long time ago—in other words, that God did wondrous things in old time, and has remained quiescent ever since? The duty of the Roman priest to say his office daily may be heavy, but to an intelligent man it ought not to be

irksome. At least, its rules, complicated though they be, remind him that the Church to which he belongs is ever living, and that sanctity is not an Apostolic virtue now extinct as the dodo. On the contrary, his attention is called to the fact that in every age and among every people God has raised up examples of what Christians ought to be like. Granted even that there are included in the calendar saints who, assuming even that they ever got to heaven, must have had a good deal to repent of, and that in the Breviaries legends are sometimes selected which are as unprofitable as they are unedifying, still there are many whose services to Christ and to humanity have been incalculable, whose names are household words even among Protestants, and yet how many even of an educated congregation ministered to by a learned priest could tell one more than a few things, mostly incorrect, about them? Augustine, Ambrose, Basil, Cyril, Hilary, to take some names at random from the Anglican calendar, are to most people names, and nothing more, and how few know that there were two very prominent Augustines, Cyrils, and Hilarys. Yet these played a very important part in the development of the Church as we now have it; gave its doctrine a permanent form, brought Christianity to our ancestors, triumphed over attempts to emasculate the faith, and it is not too much to say that, without some understanding of what they did, it is hard to comprehend some of the great movements in the Church of to-day.

Still less does the average man know of those who have contributed to make the Christianity of his own country from Bede downwards. How many Englishmen realize that their own country produced or educated some of the greatest minds of the Middle Ages; that the man who founded its learning was Anselm, who came from Italy and Normandy to be Archbishop of Canterbury; that some of the chief ornaments of the Franciscan order were born Englishmen; that St. Bernard was subject to the monastic rule established by an English saint, Stephen Harding, at Cîteaux?

But why should the Anglican Church allow it to be supposed, as some of its sons appear to desire, that after the Reformation, which they would like to call the Deformation, sanctity ceased within its borders? Sir Thomas More has been beatified in Rome, but can any Englishman deny that he was a good man with a beautiful Christian character? Cranmer committed many errors, but laid the Church under a debt which cannot be ignored. Hooker's modest and obscure life is the glory of those who value learning as one of the chief ornaments of the

true priest. But there is no need to particularize; one could pass from century to century and never fail to find names, not perhaps all of strict Churchmen, but all of good men whose example fires the blood of every true English heart.

Thus far nothing has been said that is not a plea for a revision or expansion of the calendar, a work which Convocation has for some time been engaged upon, but since the days of Archbishop Parker the calendar in our Prayer-Book has had little or no influence on devotion. Even the red-letter saints' days have not, in most cases, really stimulated worship. We seldom pause to think how little we know even by tradition of any of the twelve Apostles except St. Peter and St. John. Yet they have all to be celebrated because their names are recorded in Scripture. Even a devout and ingenious poetic mind like Keble's was hard put to it when he had to compose a poem for each in the *Christian Year*. Thus St. Andrew's Day suggests what brother can do for brother. St. Matthias suggests the thought that one who saw all the work of the Lord in a humble sphere was in the end chosen to rank as an Apostle. St. Philip and St. James evoke some verses on the dreaminess of middle age. The fact is the saints we commemorate are so little known to us as scarcely to be real. They are pegs on which ingenuity alone can hang pious reflections. If, therefore, we want to make the past of the Church real to its sons, it must be not by having lists of saints nor commemorations of those of whom nothing is known, but by presenting something on which men and women may with profit think, and by not only wisely selecting those who are to be commemorated, but also giving information concerning them. In fact, the desideratum is not so much for a calendar as for a Breviary.

The idea of the hour services—and it must be remembered that all these offices were intended for monks rather than laity, or even active clergy—is primarily the recitation of the Psalter. To repeat it daily was the work of the pious monk, and it is said that certain devotional experts could by incessant labour do it twice or more. But a less mechanical system of devotion came into being, and the Psalter was recited only once a week, collects, responds, lections, and the like being interpolated to make the offices more edifying and interesting. It is to the readings and legends to which attention should be called before considering the utility of consulting the Breviary with a view to the needs of the present day. Before doing so it may be well to take any month in our own calendar, and enquire whether it can be of service as a guide to the devotion of intelligent Christian men and women. November may be selected, and

an old calendar used for an obvious reason. The month is unusually rich in saints' days.

NOVEMBER.

1. *All Saints' Day.*
5. *Papists' Conspiracy.*
6. Leonard, C.
11. St. Martin, B.
13. Britius, B.
15. Machutus, B.
17. Hugh, B., Linc.
20. Edmund, K. and M.
22. Cecilia, V. and M.
23. St. Clement, B.
25. Catharine, V.
30. *St. Andrew, Ap.*

As regards the celebration of the Fifth of November and similar historical events, it may be said that the Church of the seventeenth century was at least alive to the fact that God's mercies were not all confined to Biblical times; and though we may not all be agreed that the preservation of James I. and his Parliament or the arrival of William III. were exceptional blessings, anyhow our fathers so regarded them and gave thanks accordingly. Have no blessings been vouchsafed to us in our days, and have we been guilty of no national sins?

The list of saints may not appeal perhaps much to the Anglican of to-day, but it is not altogether a badly selected one. St. Martin was revered in early Britain, and Augustine found a church dedicated to him when he came to convert the English. Machutus was a Welsh saint, and his name appears in St. Malo's in Brittany. Edmund, king of the East Angles, was an English saint whose name survives in Bury St. Edmunds. Hugh was a foreigner who endeared himself to the English as Bishop of Lincoln. Clement was the famous early Roman Bishop; Cecilia was a Roman; Catharine an Alexandrian martyr. Thus are we put in mind of the history of the Church in the first century by Clement; in the third by Cecilia; in the fourth by Catharine; in the sixth by Machutus; in the ninth by Edmund; and in the twelfth by Hugh. But to ninety-nine people out of a hundred not a single name means anything, even to the clergy.

In the modern Roman Breviary the names of those commemorated are as follows:

NOVEMBER.

1. *All Saints.*
2. All faithful departed (*Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum*).
4. S. Caroli, Episc. and Conf.
9. *Dedicatio Archibasilicæ Sſmi Salvatoris.*
10. S. Andreæ Avellini.
11. S. Martini, Episc.
12. S. Martini I., Pap. Martyr.
13. S. Didaci, Conf.
14. S. Josaphat, Epis. Mart.
15. S. Gertrudis, Virg.
17. S. Gregorii, Thaumaturgi Epis.
18. *Dedicatio Basilicarum SS. Petri et Pauli, Apost.*
19. S. Elizabeth, Vid.
20. S. Felicis de Valois, Conf.
21. *Præsentatio B.V.M.*
22. S. Ceciliæ, Virg. et Mart.
23. S. Clementis I., Pap. Mart.
24. S. Joannis a Cruce, Conf.
25. S. Catharinæ, Virg. et Mart.
26. S. Silvestri, Abb.
30. *S. Andreæ, Apost.*

In this list, not only are the saints of the Middle Ages commemorated, but two belong to comparatively modern times—St. Carlo Borromeo of Milan, who died in 1584; and St. Josaphat, Archbishop of Polocensis, who was martyred for his zeal for uniting the Orthodox in Russia to the Catholic Church in 1623. From the first to the eighth the month is occupied by the Feast and Octave of All Saints.

It is therefore interesting to study the Breviary and to see what sort of information the lections give about the different saints commemorated. On November 9, the feast of the dedication of the "Archbasilica of the Most Holy Saviour," after reading three lections from Rev. xxi., the fourth and following lections explain how in primitive days churches were not dedicated with solemn rites; but that in the days of Constantine "he dedicated a church to the Saviour in his palace of the Lateran, and founded in the name of St. John Baptist the adjoining basilica in which he was baptized by St. Silvester and cleansed from the leprosy of sin. Which church the Pontiff consecrated on the fifth day before the Ides of November." Then it goes on to say that Silvester decreed that henceforward altars should be made of stone, whereas hitherto they had been made of wood, as was the altar of the Lateran basilica. Finally, there is mention of the restorations of the church by Bene-

dict XIII. in 1726 and by Leo XIII. in 1884. On November 18 there is a similar celebration of the dedication of St. Peter's on the Vatican, and St. Paul's by the Ostian Way, and of the consecration of the new Vatican basilica (St. Peter's) by Urban VIII. in 1626; also of the destruction by fire of St. Paul's, its rebuilding, and of the promulgation of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception in the new church by Pius IX. in 1854.

On the festival of Clement I., on which there is also commemorated the martyr Felicitas and her seven sons, it is recorded that Clement was the son of Faustinus, the disciple of Peter, mentioned by Paul in writing to the Philippians. He divided the city into seven regions, and appointed seven notaries to record the acts of the martyrs. He was banished by Trajan to the Chersonese, and with two thousand other Christians was set to quarry marble. He wrought a miracle, and brought water to his thirsty fellow-sufferers. He was thrown into the sea with an anchor tied round his neck. His body was recovered and brought to Rome in the days of Pope Nicholas I. (†868).

Then the seventh *lectio* is a homily on the text, "Watch; for ye know not in what hour the Son of Man cometh," from St. Hilary. At Lauds a hymn is sung, *Invicte Martyr*. The Collect is "God, Who makest us glad every year by the celebration of Clement, Thy Martyr and Pontiff, mercifully grant that we may imitate the virtue of his passion whose martyrdom and natal day we celebrate; through our Lord," etc. Still keeping to the local Roman Church, the festival of St. Cecilia may be mentioned. It is, perhaps, not necessary to do more than allude to the legend of her conversion of her husband on their wedding day and of her martyrdom. The Antiphon alone connects her with music: "Cantantibus organis Cæcilia Domino decantabat dicens: Fiat cor meum immaculatum, et non confundar."

The foregoing will reveal many of the faults of the Roman Breviary, not among the least the contemptuous disregard of the Church for historical truth witnessed in the continued acceptation of the legend that Constantine was baptized by Silvester, whereas he was, as every beginner in Church history knows, really admitted to the Church on his death-bed by Eusebius of Nicomedia. But its defects must not make one blind to its merit. No one who uses the Breviary can be ignorant that the Church has a continuous history and saints belong to all ages. An attempt, at least, is made to give the reader variety and some new interest on most days of the year. At least, the priest or religious person who uses it intelligently has a wider prospect brought before him than he who recites daily the offices of Morning and Evening Prayer. The question is whether with

an amended calendar a proper selection of suitable readings could not be made and licence be given to use them in the daily services of the Church with discretion. The calendar need not be the same everywhere, and considerable latitude should be allowed for local usage.

The difference between the average English and the Roman view of sanctity is fundamental.* In the Breviary, for example, sanctity, as is implied in the whole process of canonization, connotes something miraculous. The saint is not as other men are. He has power with God denied to ordinary mortals, and the possession of this is confirmed by miracle. To most of us, on the contrary, a saint is a good man judged from a moral rather than a supernatural standpoint. St. Jerome and St. Augustine to a good Catholic are equally saints, and St. Peter, Martyr, is comparable with St. Francis of Assisi. We should be rather inclined to judge by character. Jerome, for example, was a great scholar and a most devout monk; on the other hand, he seems to have been as a controversialist an evil-tempered man with a large fund of uncharitable abuse with which he was always prepared to overwhelm those who differed from him. On the other hand, Augustine, judged by his *Confessions*, was one of those who really sought the Kingdom of God, and even in his controversial writings he often reveals a spirit which is truly Christian. Yet neither of them are blameless nor infallible as guides; both made mistakes which have had seriously evil consequences. Judged, however, by a moral standard, we should be inclined to give the name of saint to Augustine and withhold it from Jerome, whilst refusing to worship either as even supernatural men. Yet why should we be encouraged to meditate on the conversion of St. Paul, of which we know so little, and completely to ignore that of St. Augustine, which is related in one of the most admirable self-revelations in all literature? Equally irrational is it that a sermon on Apollos as "mighty in the Scripture" would be more in keeping in a Protestant pulpit than one on Jerome, who devoted his wide erudition and his literary experience to translating and explaining the Word of God.

But why confine our Breviary to the fourth century? Or, for that matter, to the middle or any other age, or to the typical saint, who is as a rule ecclesiastically minded? The men we want to hold up as examples are the good men, especially of our own race, and those to whom we owe a debt of gratitude. Bishop John Wordsworth drew up a calendar for his diocese of Salisbury as a suggestion for a reformed calendar for the Anglican Church, and for November the following names are selected:

* See note on p. 226

November 2, All Souls: Richard Hooker, 1600.
November 4: Perpetua, wife of St. Peter. St. Charles Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, 1584.
November 7: Willibrord, missionary to Frisia, 739.
November 16: Ælfric, Bishop of Ramsbury and Archbishop of Canterbury, 1006. Edmund Rich, Archbishop, 1240.
November 17: Hilda, Abbess, 680. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln, 1200.
November 21: Columban of Leinster, Abbot of Bobbio, 615.
November 30: St. Andrew, Archbishop, martyred at Patras. Frumentius, Bishop, Apostle of Abyssinia (*circa* 353). Francis Xavier, missionary, 1552.

These additions to the Anglican calendar are interesting, and show the learning and large sympathy of the Bishop. But there is in the selection a certian medievalism which is to me, at least, somewhat unreal. The old custom should be followed of each province or diocese having liberty to make its own calendar (of course, within limits), but in our communion the laity ought to have a full share of every calendar, and not merely paragons of piety, but good men who have used their ability for the good of mankind. Among clergy like George Herbert and E. Law the Non-juror, Bishop Ken, Bishop Wilson of Sodor and Man, should be placed not merely laymen like Robert Boyle or the Earl of Shaftesbury, but Addison, Samuel Johnson, William Cowper, and others. It is, however, dangerous to suggest names, and it is better to pass on to discuss the form a Breviary such as is suggested should assume.

The part of the Breviary hitherto under discussion is the lectionary. The idea of the Anglican lectionary was that the Bible should be read through in the daily lessons once a year, and the most important parts on the Sundays. Practically this works out that every Sunday the worshipper listens to a long chapter of the Bible torn from its context, and, at any rate as regards the New Testament, the same thing happens on the Sunday following. This is not particularly edifying, and does not attract the attention of the average worshipper. But a lesson might be learned by the study of the lections in the Breviary.

Take, for example, those for September 2, the feast of St. Stephen of Hungary, King and Confessor. The lections are all of them short, and divided from one another by responds. They give a brief account of the king, his piety, his death, and the fragrance which marked his sanctity after death, and his canonization by Innocent XI. at the time of the capture of Buda from the Turks by the Emperor and King of Hungary, Leopold I. Then follow a few extracts from a sermon of St.

Ambrose on the Parable of the Talents. But upon the whole the Breviary is a little disappointing though suggestive, and an Anglican one could be made more real if those whom it commemorates were made more living.

Supposing, for example, a day was set apart to celebrate St. Anselm, the most original and most powerful mind who ever adorned the See of Canterbury. Let a short lection explain who he was and why he is to be honoured, and an extract from his writings be read. Or if a day were given to Cranmer, it would be well to inform people why he deserves, for all his shortcomings, so well of the Church of England, if only for his unrivalled skill as shown in the Prayer-Book. By this means many who are now mere names would be made known, and the devout worshipper could either read of them or hear of them in church. The prayers which each composed might be recited, their truest and best utterances might be repeated, to put people in mind of the undying piety of the Church of Christ.

The Anglican Church has a truly immense storehouse to draw upon, and if she chooses to avail herself of the piety of all English-speaking Christians, the treasury would be wellnigh inexhaustible. The need of the present day is to vitalize worship, which has everywhere tended to become more and more formal or irreverent. One danger is to endeavour to rekindle the lamp of worship by the light of the past. This has been the attempt of the Oxford Movement and all that came from out of it. The other is to borrow light from the future, and to think that nothing worth happening has hitherto come to pass. But surely it is better to endeavour to understand the past and to realize the facts of the present, and so to provide fuel for the future light to kindle.

F. J. Foakes Jackson.

Note on p. 224.—We do not know what Dr. Foakes Jackson means by the "average English" view; but, even when quite uninstructed, we doubt whether it is so different as he thinks from the Roman view. It is precisely in character that the supernatural most plainly declares itself. There is much in St. Jerome's character which is disagreeable: there is nothing which is not on a great scale; and his inclusion in the calendar may be taken as evidence that the Church interprets sanctity broadly, and recognizes greatness no less than charm.—Ed.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Mr. Thouless's article resumes the two articles on "Religious Authority" which appeared in September and October of last year. Mr. Thouless is a Research Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Lecturer in Psychology at Manchester University. Readers of Theology will remember his contributions to the study of Conversion published in December, 1920, and February, 1921.

The Rev. J. K. Floyer is Rector of Esher. He is a Vice-President of the Archæological Institute, and compiled the catalogue of MSS. when Librarian of Worcester Cathedral.

The Dean of Winchester needs no introduction. Nor does Dr. Foakes Jackson. His latest book—*An Introduction to the History of Christianity*, A.D. 590-1314 (Macmillan, 20s. net)—will be reviewed shortly in these columns.

Professor Alexander Souter, D.Litt., has been Regius Professor of Humanity in the University of Aberdeen since 1911. He is well known as the editor of a Greek New Testament published in 1910.

Mr. Will Spens, who reviews Dr. Gore's *Belief in God*, is Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. He published a series of apologetical lectures entitled *Belief and Practice* in 1915, which is now in its second edition, and was a member of the Subjects Committee of the Anglo-Catholic Congress two years ago.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of Theology

THE VIRGIN BIRTH

Sir,

I have seen it stated recently that we have no evidence that the early Christians were taught the doctrine of Our Lord's Virgin Birth. But is not this a mistake? For St. Luke says that he only wrote his Gospel so that Theophilus might know the certainty of the things about which he had already been instructed. Clearly, then, the course of instruction must have included what the Gospel included, and this was the whole of Christ's Life from His Virgin Birth to His Ascension. If Theophilus had only been taught about Our Lord's public life, St. Luke would scarcely have written a Gospel to assure him of the truth of this, and then commence it with a long account of Our Lord's Virgin Birth and early years (occupying 132 verses) about which he had been taught nothing.

Yours, etc.,

W. H. Turton,

Lieut.-Colonel.

PAPERS FOR THE PRIESTHOOD

IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

ADVICE ON BOOKS

If readers who require advice on courses of theological study or the choice of books care to write to the Editorial Department of S.P.C.K., an attempt will be made to give them the required information. Sixpence in stamps should be sent to cover the cost of the necessary correspondence. It will frequently be necessary to refer the enquiry to an expert; a number of well-known scholars have consented to help in this way. Sometimes, especially in the summer months, there may be a little delay in answering. The Editor reserves the right to publish answers if they are of sufficient general interest. In such cases the initials of the correspondents will be given.

IX.—FOREIGN THEOLOGY

At the risk of arousing dormant prejudices I should like to recommend the study of foreign theology, at least to certain classes of students. If we wish to be confirmed in Anglican prejudices, by all means let us stick to Anglican books, or perhaps we had better say English books; for there is generally a family resemblance to be discerned in English writings, whether of Anglican or Protestant origin. But if our purpose in reading is to learn, then a liberal proportion of foreign books is desirable, for two reasons.

1. Few can read a French, German, or Italian author as readily as an English one. If the argument is to be followed, careful and steady reading is necessary. Those who read much get into the habit of grasping the meaning of a page without troubling to read the actual words. With many books thus to tear out the heart is the best way. But such desultory methods must be carefully controlled, or they will invade every part of our reading, and make us incapable of sustained mental effort. No better remedy against their undue extension can be suggested than the study of books in a foreign language.

2. Anyone who confines himself to English books is liable to the danger of becoming provincial in his outlook, and especially so to-day, when few translations are put on the English market. After 1815 England relapsed into a contented insularity which we condemn from a safe distance, though, unless we take care, history will repeat itself. From every point of view we ought to keep in touch with Continental culture, which is older and in some ways saner than ours. English Churchmen are peculiarly liable to provincialism. The Roman Catholics belong to a mighty Church, the Nonconformists are in touch with world-Protestant movements. We belong to a small Church, tempted to think itself great because it has mapped out the world in dioceses.

Two things brought home to me the absurdity of some Anglican pretensions. Bishop Nicolai Velimirovic, at a small gathering in London about the time of the Armistice, urged close co-operation between the Serbian and English Churches, because both were "small Churches"

confronted with great Churches. And this is how it looks from the Continent. The other thing was a sentence in a recent number of a German periodical, the organ of the *Hochkirche* Union, in which it was maintained that the Lutheran Church was the natural centre of Christendom and destined to be the meeting point in Reunion projects. Smiling at the absurdity, I remembered similar claims advanced nearer home, and *de te fabula* sounded in my ears. There are in contemporary Christendom two religious forces of first-class magnitude—Rome and American Protestantism with its vast wealth and tireless energy—the rest of us are little people. But you will not realize this if you read only your own authors.

To return to our subject. Germany is the home of scientific theology, and much that is best in every branch is obtainable only in German. The sceptical books translated into English form but a small proportion of the total output. Monographs abound on every subject. Research is organized in a methodical way. The best tools for the scholar's workshop are generally of German make.

But if the difficulty of the German language or prejudices which cannot be ignored prevent us from reading German books, then let us read French books. The language is easy enough if the subject-matter is familiar. The best French Catholic books are extraordinarily good. Roman Catholic books in English are generally controversial, but French theology is more objective in its treatment. The works of scholars like Batiffol, Lagrange, Lebreton, or Jacquier cannot be too warmly recommended to the English priest. The University of Louvain, in particular, bids fair to be the greatest centre in the world of scientific theology on orthodox lines.

American books are not so helpful as French and German. Owing to the exchange they are very expensive. The presses of Harvard, Yale, and Chicago turn out highly technical works of great merit, and there is a plethora of books of the "Bible Institute" type; but, so far, not many books exist written in a thorough and not too technical style which the English scholar-priest will find it worth his while to procure.

NOTES

I.—WHAT DO WE MEAN BY THE WORD "GOD"?

Some thoughts on the Cambridge Conference of Modern Churchmen

The Modernist is usually ready to join with the traditionalist in saying "Jesus is God"; yet their faith seems different, and this has led some of the traditionalists to accuse the Modernists of insincerity. I want to suggest that the real explanation is that the two parties are giving a different connotation to the word "God," and if that be so, it is incumbent on us who criticize the Modernists that we should be clear what the word means to us.

The first point I want to make is that we *must* have *some* conception of God apart from Jesus Christ, otherwise the affirmation "Jesus is God" is meaningless; one might just as well say "Jesus is *x*." This seems

obvious, yet some of the modern Churchmen (*e.g.*, Dr. Bethune-Baker and Mr. Nowell Smith) do not seem to be alive to this necessity.

If we are asked, "*What* conception of God is necessary?" our answer is, "The one that our Lord and His followers took over from Judaism." As Mr. Major and other writers clearly recognize, Jesus claimed to be the Jewish Messiah; He came, not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfil; He reaffirmed as the first duty of man the old command to love "Yahweh, thy God." Even a resurrection from the dead would have no message to those who refused to hear Moses and the prophets. We of this generation, who have been brought up on "Lux Mundi," have learnt —quite rightly—to regard Greek philosophy, Hindu mysticism, Confucian and Buddhist ethics, as well as Hebrew prophecy, as παιδαγωγὸι εἰς χριστόν. And there is a real danger that this—true though it is—should blind us to the fact that it was in a special sense, as the culmination of Jewish revelation, that the Christ came; and we cannot hope to understand in what sense the Son is the "express image of God's Person," unless we consider first how God spoke of old time to the fathers through the prophets. My claim, then, is that Jesus and His Apostles *assumed* the Jewish conception of God: in some respects He corrected it; in many ways He deepened our insight into God's character; but His idea of *Deity* as such was that of the Jew, and if that were so for Christ, it must also be for the Christian.

Our next question, therefore, is, "What was the distinctively Jewish conception of Deity?" It is commonly said that the distinctive doctrine of Jewish theology was that of the *righteousness* of God. I want to challenge this statement. Of course, I do not deny that the doctrine of God's righteousness was a very valuable part of Israel's contribution to religious thought; but, though the Jews had grasped it more clearly than most other peoples, it was not an exclusively Jewish doctrine; it was taught clearly in Persian religion and in some of the higher strands of Greek and Indian thought. But I suggest that the primary doctrine of Jewish theology was that God is Creator, "Maker of all things visible and invisible." For the Greeks and for many other peoples there was a very vague dividing line between gods and men; it was natural enough for Lysander (or later the Roman Emperors) to be worshipped as gods in their lifetime; but for the Jew there was always an impassable gulf between God and all else, because there always must be a gulf between Creator and creature. This does not conflict with the doctrine of a kinship between God and man; Judaism taught that, but *based it on the creation:* it was because God had created man in His own image. Nor does it mean that there can be no intimate communion between God and man; the existence of the Psalter refutes that. But in and through all this there was the clear dividing line—on one side the Creator, on the other all else. I do not think it is without significance that on the one occasion when the New Testament appeals to the witness of non-Jewish religion—St. Paul's speech at Athens—the Apostle only does so *after* he has asserted the truth of God as Creator.

If I am right in claiming that the Church must—because Jesus did—assume the Jewish conception of Deity, and that the primary doctrine of Jewish theism was that God is Creator, this must have a great influence on Christology. And so in the early centuries it had. The gulf between Creator and creature was assumed; the problem was on which side the Person of Jesus was to be placed, and this was the real issue between

Athanasius and Arius. That our Lord was human, and that His humanity was created, was common ground between them. Arius was willing to concede a complete unity of will between the Son and the Father; he accorded to Jesus the title "full God, only-begotten" (πλήρης θεὸς μονογενής). But the real crux was whether He was Creator or creature, and it was Creator-hood (if one may coin the word) that was really the chief point in the οὐσία of the Father which Nicæa claimed for Jesus. I believe that still to-day the one truly vital question about the Godhead of our Lord is, Is Jesus in His essential being—His οὐσία—Creator or creature?

Here, at least, we have a *definite* conception of our Lord's Deity. I want now simply to quote several utterances from different writers in the *Modern Churchman* on the subject, and then to examine *one* statement a little more in detail. Canon Glazebrook says (p. 213) that the early Fathers, "ignoring the Lord's own teaching, adopted the pre-Christian assumption that an absolute gulf separated the natures of God and man." If what is said above is true, the assumption is not merely pre-Christian, but Christian. Canon Tollinton (p. 245) says: "Believing that in the character and teaching of Jesus we do come into contact with ultimate reality, then we need not hesitate to speak of God as revealed in Jesus." Again, Mr. Nowell Smith (p. 267): "Though, so far as I can understand it, I assent to the proposition that Jesus is God, yet God in that proposition is to me an adjective. Whatever Jesus means by calling Himself Son of God, or by saying (if He did say) 'I and My Father are one,' it is clear that He did not mean that He was identical, or (to use a metaphor again) co-extensive, with God." Or Dr. Bethune Baker: "God stands to me for the highest values in life, and because I believe those values were actualized in the person and life of Jesus, I must use the title 'God' of Him. . . . Jesus is the creator of my God" (pp. 300–1). Or even Dean Rashdall (by far the profoundest thinker of the group): "That we are justified in thinking of God as like Christ, that the character and teaching of Christ contains the fullest disclosure both of the character of God Himself and of His will for man—that is (so far as so momentous a truth may be summed up in a few words) the true meaning for us of the doctrine of Christ's Divinity" (p. 283). I do not suggest that these statements are all false; but I think that, when we compare them with the traditional formulæ of the Church which most of these writers (not, however, Dr. Rashdall) criticize, we find a vagueness and uncertainty, due to a failure to get a clear conception of what is meant by "God." They are not so much modern thought as shoddy thought.

In conclusion, I want to analyze a little more closely one sentence in Mr. Major's Introduction, where he is endeavouring (in my judgment successfully) to summarize the underlying ideas of the Cambridge Conference. He says, in avowed opposition to Chalcedon: "Perfect humanity is Deity under human conditions." If what was urged above is true, this statement is false. Deity is essentially Creator, humanity essentially created, and under *no* conditions can the two be identical. May I illustrate this by a slightly different point, which is, however, I think, relevant? Many Christians have believed in the entire sinlessness of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It is beside our present purpose to discuss whether this is true (personally I believe it is); but I want to raise the question, *If* that were true, could we rightly speak of her as Divine or even as God? It seems to me that on Mr. Major's principles we should have to

answer "Yes"; on traditional Catholic principles we answer "No, because she is only a creature." I think this makes clear the contrast between the Catholic and the Modernist conceptions of Deity. I cannot see that the Modernist conception of Christ is any higher than the Roman (and not exclusively Roman) conception of Mary. It is as a safeguard against such a Christology that we need to cling to the doctrine which Dr. Bethune Baker says we must "absolutely jettison," that Christ's personality is "not human, but Divine." The *expression* is open to objections, which it is easy enough to indicate, and I hope the progress of theology may lead us, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, to a more satisfactory terminology; but the underlying thought that Jesus in His essential being is God the Creator and not a creature must at all costs be conserved.

PERCY HARTILL.

II.—THE TOMB OF LAZARUS AND THE TEXT OF ST. JOHN

IT was a beautiful morning in October, the air of the hills of Jerusalem was vivifying after the heat of the desert, and we were quite ready for a walk to Bethany. Down the hill we went, skirting the city walls rebuilt by Suleiman the Magnificent in A.D. 1542, then across "the brook Kedron," at that time dried up, and soon began to climb the rough, stony footpath up the Mount of Olives toward Bethany. Passing the Garden of Gethsemane on our right, we soon found ourselves at the spot where on looking back there is a glorious view of the Holy City, and on the wall close by it is stated that at this point our Lord wept over Jerusalem. Though there is some dispute as to whether this is the exact spot or not, one thing is certain—it would scarcely be possible to find a finer view. There straight in front of us was the Mosque of the Dome of the Rock—commonly though wrongly called the Mosque of Omar—and close to it the Mosque of Aksa, both standing in the Temple area; there beyond were the minarets and towers; and farther away, towards the right, the domes of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre.

At the highest point of the pathway a new view opened out in front of us. There far away down below us were the deep blue waters of the Dead Sea, and beyond were the rough red rocks and cliffs of the mountains of Moab, bringing back memories of Moses and of that tomb of which no man knoweth, of his vision of the Holy Land from Mount Nebo, of Jacob wrestling with the angel, of Balaam brought by Balak to curse the children of Israel from Pisgah's heights. Near at hand, just below us, at the foot of the south-eastern slope of Olivet lay Bethany, a squalid ruined village, but once the home of Mary, Martha, and Lazarus, and a sacred spot not only to Christians, but also to Mohammedans, for they look upon Christ as a great prophet ranking far above Moses but inferior to Mohammed himself.

When both Mohammedan and Christian traditions agree upon a site in the Holy Land as being the spot where some incident in our Lord's life took place, we may certainly look upon this site at least as probable. For Mohammedans have a great reverence for holy places connected with any whom they look upon as prophets, and as a rule preserve them carefully.

Our first visit was to a ruined house of which very little remains, a

small archway and the foundations, the reputed home of that family in the bosom of which our Lord spent the last few nights before His crucifixion. A door in a wall leads into a garden, supposed to be that of the home of Simon the leper, in the midst of which is an olive-tree of enormous girth, said to be that under which our Lord sat with Simon. Tradition dies hard in the East, and it may be that these traditions are true. But it was in the tomb shown as the tomb of Lazarus that an incident occurred which pointed to the great probability of the site which is shown being the actual spot where the resurrection of Lazarus took place.

On the roadside there is a square opening in a rock, the entrance to the tomb of Lazarus. Twenty-six steps, greasy and green with damp, lead from the vivid sunshine to the dark and dismal cave below. Then, on the left, from the floor of the cave further steps descend into the tomb. These steps were evidently once covered by a stone, to judge by what would appear to be a groove on the two sides of the stonework between which the steps descend.

Whilst looking at all these things someone said: "Well, this could not have been the tomb of Lazarus, for it is quite impossible to roll away a stone here." There is of course nothing in the text of St. John about *rolling* away a stone, though, in thinking merely of the usual method in which the Jews buried their dead, the remark was a natural one. This remark, however, made the writer study the Greek text, and such study has led him to the conclusion that not only is it possible for the traditional site to be the tomb of Lazarus, but that the probability amounts almost to a moral certainty.

First, the tomb is in a cave, a fact which agrees with the words of St. John xi. 38, "now it was a cave" (σπήλαιον). That fact in itself is not much to go upon, for the Jews often used caves as places of burial, numbers of tombs sometimes being cut in the rock of the sides of the cave as in the case of the tombs of the Kings, near Jerusalem, and of Dorcas, which is shown just outside Jaffa (Joppa.)

Secondly, St. John appears to be writing as one who had seen the cave, and knew the details of the method of the burial of Lazarus, for he continues, "and a stone lay upon it" (ἐπέκειτο), a word which surely could not be used for a stone which was standing upright against the mouth of a tomb, for ἐπίκειμαι means "to lie or be laid upon."

Thirdly, the word ἐπί governing the dative seems almost to demand the translation "upon," the dative of accumulation, one thing upon another. The revisers, however, translate it "against," though the margin has "upon"—a translation which would appear to have been given because they did not see how it was possible to place the stone *upon* the opening of the tomb, when in most cases of Jewish burial it was placed *against* it.

Fourthly, in verse 39 we have the words "Take ye away the stone" (Ἄρατε τὸν λίθον), in verse 41 "then they took away the stone" (ἦραν οὖν τὸν λίθον), followed by the words "and Jesus lifted up his eyes" (ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἦρε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω). In the last case ἦρε is translated "lifted," but ἄρατε and ἦραν are translated by the words "take" and "took." All these words, however, are from the verb αἴρω, which bears the sense of the Latin *tollo*, or even *elevo*. Translated in this way we should read: "Lift ye up the stone," "They lifted therefore the stone. But Jesus lifted up His eyes."* It is the most natural sense of the Greek

* In the R.V. the words οὗ ἦν τεθνηκὼς κείμενος are omitted.

text; the words exactly coincide with what we should have expected as a description of what took place, after examining the cave which is shown as the tomb of Lazarus.

The examination of the Greek text does not necessarily make it conclusive that the traditional site shown as the tomb of Lazarus is the actual cave in which Lazarus was buried; but it would appear to show that the tomb was one in which the stone had to be *lifted* rather than *rolled*, and it was this fact which was patent to the present writer when he visited it only a few weeks before the Armistice was declared in 1918. On visiting other tombs he was struck by the fact that this was the only one in a cave in which it was possible for the stone to lie upon, instead of against, the opening.

When we remember the number of people who came out to Bethany to see Lazarus after he was raised from the dead, we feel that there must have been a very strong tradition as to the site of his tomb, and this short examination of the Greek text has proved, not that the words of Scripture are against this tradition, but rather that they agree in every way with it.

T. Francis Forth.

REVIEWS

"Belief in God." By Charles Gore, D.D., Hon. Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford, and late Bishop of Oxford. London: John Murray. 1921. Pp. 300. 7s. 6d.

Probably all readers of this review are already familiar with Dr. Gore's purpose. He proposes to publish three books on the reconstruction of belief, of which the first deals with belief in God, the second will deal with belief in Christ, and the third with belief in the Holy Spirit and in the Church. The present volume is therefore concerned with the grounds for Theism and with the content of Christian Theism.

Dr. Gore begins by discussing the breakdown of tradition and the conditions of hopeful reconstruction, reaching the conclusion which, it may be noted, he shares with Dr. Tennant, that we cannot hope at present for a general reconstruction of Christian thought which will be at all universally acceptable. The most we can do is to prepare for this. Dr. Gore scarcely emphasizes as much as he might the fact that this position is due in large measure to the extent to which the problems of apologetics have been transferred to the field of epistemology; but that Dr. Gore's view is otherwise correct is scarcely disputable. As in so much of our civilization we have to pay a price for the fact that men are differing in their assumptions.

After his preliminary survey, Dr. Gore goes on to discuss the grounds of belief in God, following, in the main, current philosophical arguments for Theism, and giving a highly condensed but valuable summary of the epistemological, æsthetic, and moral arguments. The weight given to the second of these arguments is not the least interesting feature of this part of the discussion. Dr. Gore concludes that such arguments "make faith in God in some sense a rational necessity." He holds, however, that philosophy does not thus give an account of God which is at all adequate for the purposes of religion. It fails to answer pressing questions as to the relation of individuals to God, as to His transcendence and as to His righteousness. Dr. Gore meets this situation by arguing that revelation is not an incredible idea, and by facing the question as to whether revelation has not in fact taken place. He turns to the Hebrew prophets from Amos to Malachi, and to our Lord (regarded for the moment simply as a prophet), and he argues that no other explanation affords an adequate account of their teaching. He concludes that "it is very hard to resist the conviction that the prophets and Jesus Christ (regarded at present simply as

one of the prophets) were in touch—as other men were not—with reality, with the real God." Accepting the reality of the revelation, Dr. Gore proceeds to discuss its intellectual content. He then considers how far this can be reconciled with our other knowledge, and argues that neither the natural sciences nor the study of comparative religion nor historical criticism offers valid criticism. In regard to philosophy he claims that the conception of God which the Hebrew religion affords makes possible a considerable advance in thought. The greatest difficulty appears to him to lie, in this field, in the interpretation of the whole experience of the universe in terms of divine goodness and love; but he holds that this difficulty should be set aside, in large measure on the ground that "the doctrine of God's goodness has been undoubtedly verified in the deepest experience of the best of men, not least in the greatest sufferers."

Dr. Gore then goes on to make clear that an historical religion is implied and involved, and to discuss the resulting position. In this portion of the book he necessarily anticipates much which might otherwise have been kept back to be included in his second volume. He discusses the basis of historical criticism, prejudice against miracle, and the historical evidence for miracles. Necessary as is this portion of the book, it is hardly profitable to review it save in the light of Dr. Gore's coming volume, and I propose to content myself with one remark. In his final chapter Dr. Gore emphasizes that the question of miracles is directly bound up with the question of the nature of God, and that if the God of the Hebrew prophets be indeed the Very God, miracles become natural. He emphasizes further the close connection of the belief that this is so with belief in a real but limited free will in man. It is at present hardly possible to exaggerate the importance of insistence upon these two points.

To return to the initial and more fundamental part of Dr. Gore's argument, the main point which I would wish to make by way rather of comment than of criticism is, that Dr. Gore seems to me not to bring out with sufficient clearness the extent to which his construction rests on a series of intuitive judgments. Even when he is dealing with philosophical arguments for Theism these are deeply involved. He assumes, for example, in common with other writers, the validity of certain value judgments. His treatment of the argument from beauty affords perhaps the best illustration. When he passes on to consider the Hebrew prophets the same comment is true in an enhanced degree. I do not think Dr. Gore would claim that his criticism of alternative explanations of the prophets' work rigorously excludes all other possibilities than their inspiration

by God. Unless I have misunderstood his argument, he draws attention to certain features and conditions of the prophets' teaching, to certain difficulties in accepting a variety of conceivable explanations, and invites his readers to feel certain that the only tenable explanation is that of divine inspiration.

It is hardly possible to deny that the acceptance of Theism almost invariably arises in some such way, that rigorous demonstration is impossible, and that even if this were possible it would not justify Christian belief. With the very great majority even of educated people who accept Theism, what appears to occur is that in face of certain facts, which differ from man to man, the individual comes to feel certain that there must be a God. If we are to justify such belief, we have got not merely to justify the truth of Theism, but to justify the actual process of believing. If Theism could be rigorously demonstrated by metaphysics, we would still have to justify its acceptance by men who are unaware of this demonstration and incapable of forming an opinion as to its validity. Since this is the case we may well welcome Dr. Gore's method of treatment, whether it is considered from a theoretical or a practical point of view, and in this latter connection many of us will realize more fully from his volume the value of the Hebrew prophets as affording facts which are calculated to be of great weight in moving men to a Theistic conclusion.

On the other hand, it is impossible not to regret that Dr. Gore does not discuss more fully the legitimacy of the psychological process to which he, in fact, appeals. Clearly, a large number of educated men—even if they read carefully the Hebrew prophets and are all in good faith—will, nevertheless, fail to reach at the end a certainty that the work of these prophets involved a divine revelation. In consequence it becomes necessary to establish the conclusion that those who are thus moved by the Hebrew prophets or by some other series of facts to an intuitive affirmation of Theism are more likely—and much more likely—to be right than those who are not so moved. Because I believe that apologetics have got to base themselves on intuitive affirmations, I can see no way of avoiding the conclusion that the central problem for current apologetics must be to establish this contention.

It is for this reason and in this connection that I regret what seems to me the very inadequate weight which Dr. Gore and so many others give to the argument from religious experience. It is not possible in this review to do more than indicate very briefly that argument, and the difficulty is enhanced by a special complexity which results from the fact that religious experience is very largely—although not entirely—conditioned

by an antecedent acceptance of belief in God. Analogy from other fields, to take one consideration alone, may lead us to the conclusion that in proportion, and only in proportion, as men become familiar with a particular field of experience and with attempts at its co-ordination, are they likely to reach, in regard to such experience, intuitive affirmations which will tend to be valid. On this basis it is possible to argue that the intuitive affirmations as to the religious significance of the Hebrew prophets, which are made by men who have a deep religious experience, are the only intuitive affirmations on the subject to which serious weight need be attached. One is met, however, at once by an obvious retort. It is necessary to admit that an antecedent acceptance of Theism is in a high degree a necessary condition of religious experience. In consequence one is *prima facie* open to the charge of appealing to a jury which is at least very largely so selected as to exclude anybody who reaches another conclusion than that in question.

I do not believe that this retort invalidates the argument. It does, however, give to it, as I have said, a special complexity, and for the moment all that is possible is to indicate grounds for belief that the argument is not invalid without attempting any complete statement of its positive character. In the first place, the feature which is evidential is not acceptance of Theism, but its intuitive affirmation with a strong sense of certainty. While such a sense of certainty admittedly assists religious experience, the feature which alone is normally necessary for religious experience is *acceptance* of Theism. Compare the case of science, where there is a fundamental assumption—the uniformity of nature—which is, in fact, based on, and which in all probability must be based on, intuitive affirmation. In the case of science, as in the case of religion, there is a widespread tendency to affirm the fundamental assumption—uniformity in the one case and Theism in the other—as an intuition antecedent to any great familiarity with the relevant field of experience. In each case the beliefs in question are also very widely accepted on grounds of authority. In each case, however, there emerges, from familiarity with the relevant experiences and their co-ordination, an intenser and more personal intuition of the fundamental belief. It is this growth of a personal sense of certainty which is important. As a result of familiarity with relevant experience, intuition tends to deal with experience with increasing success in other and verifiable directions, and this gives significance to the fact that an intenser and far more personal affirmation emerges from experience. Further, even in so far as the affirmation is antecedent, it remains true that the important point is whether the

capacity behind the affirmation does or does not prove a successful guide to experience where a check is possible. As I have argued elsewhere, we have to consider whether the instinct which prompts the affirmation is, in fact, successful in leading us to conceptions which correctly indicate the possibilities and conditions of experience; and when we turn in this direction—for example, to advance in respect of particular theories—the position is at least as good in the case of religion as in that of science.

For better or for worse it seems clear that men's religious beliefs do, in fact, rest on intuitive affirmations, that the pastoral problem consists in presenting to them facts which will lead them to make such affirmations, and that the problem for apologetics consists, in large measure, in justifying the view that the psychological process from which such affirmations emerge is a process which is calculated to arrive at truth. For better or for worse, it seems difficult to see how this can be maintained unless the position can be established that familiarity with religious experience is a necessary condition to give weight to intuitive affirmations for or against the fundamental assumptions of religion. Those who are trying to work on the argument from religious experience are familiar with the main difficulties in that argument—more familiar than some of their critics appear to suppose. On the other hand, the argument appears to them not only essential, but capable of being made good. If it can be shown that it is not essential, so much the better from every point of view. The trouble in current apologetics is that again and again, in cases where little regard is paid to this argument, the discussion is found to presuppose its validity.

I do not wish to suggest that these considerations, in so far as they are correct, imply that Dr. Gore has not accomplished the task which he attempted. His book is essentially an *ad hominem* presentation of Christian Theism. If it is true that belief in Theism—or, at least, in Christian Theism—rests ultimately on an intuitive affirmation, then what is important in such a presentation is that it should draw attention to facts which will move the largest possible number of men to make the necessary affirmation. It would only be a snare and a delusion if no such jump was required. The test of Dr. Gore's work will be found in the extent to which it strengthens belief in Christian Theism. This is none the less true even if his method presupposes rather than establishes the validity of an assumption which is involved in accepting his argument. The task of justifying that assumption is at once so fundamental and so involved that it is better treated separately; and it is a task which is likely to receive more adequate treatment in the next

than in the present generation, when modern psychology has progressed farther. It is for this reason that I agree with Dr. Gore's view that for the present we can only pave the way to any general acceptance of Christian thought.

WILL SPENS.

MODERN RELIGIOUS TEACHING

PRESENT-DAY PROBLEMS IN RELIGIOUS TEACHING. By Hetty Lee, M.A. Pp. viii+176. Macmillan and Co. London. 1920. 3s. 6d. net.

THE CHILD'S KNOWLEDGE OF GOD. By the Rev. T. Grigg-Smith, M.A., Director of Religious Education in the Southern Division of the Diocese of Manchester. Pp. x +276. Macmillan and Co., London, 1920. 7s. 6d. net.

The standpoint from which these two books are written is probably one and the same, but the results are widely different.

Miss Lee's book is a curious mixture of practical experience and philosophic failure, which latter is too frequent and obvious. For example, she perpetually tries to explain the inexplicable, to eliminate mystery. After all, bigger children than the one she quotes ask, "If God knew the devil was going to be wicked, why did He make him?" Perhaps an answer is less impossible than she implies. Even simple words and phrases suffice to propound the value and responsibility of the gift of freewill, and the disaster of a perverted one. Elsewhere, her ethics seem weak and narrow; why, *e.g.*, exalt happiness as the only "end" (p. 37); and, again, why make love the whole and sole basis of religious teaching (pp. 35 and 77), specially when you are planning for an age like the present, which seems pressingly to need some instruction about the justice of God and the immaculacy of His holiness, without some emulation and share of which no man may see Him?

Mr. Grigg-Smith's aim in religious teaching, on the other hand, is not narrowed, like Miss Lee's, to inculcating the love of God; nor does he subscribe to the curious idea so rife now that the wrongness of an action consists in its unkindness or injustice to some other human being rather than in its soul-destroying effect; he writes of it as "a means of encouraging and strengthening in the children that healthy, happy growth in the knowledge and service of God and man which we hope may always supply the supreme power in life" (p. 25).

He deprecates the current and fashionable objection to "prohibitive" teaching—*i.e.*, teaching the Ten Command-

ments to young children—urging that from our earliest childhood we do as a matter of fact run up against unyielding prohibitions (p. 64); and, finally, he pleads that the Ten Commandments and other Divine prohibitions are always intended as warnings about what is right and wrong, and are in no way to be regarded as motives for or incentives to good conduct.

The carefully planned syllabuses at the end of the book, though they need not be regarded, as the author says, as final—indeed, he suggests that " a syllabus that has been unrevised for thirty, or even for four, years, stands self-condemned "—should, with their orderly sequence, come to many young, and perhaps to some not young, teachers laden with guidance and fresh suggestion.

With one matter which has a direct bearing on educational theory and practice—namely, the question of confession—Mr. Grigg-Smith deals plainly, with no beating about the bush. He first brings confession of spiritual troubles into line with " the modern medical treatment of nervous disorders " (p. 130), quoting the following passage from Messrs. Elliot Smith and Pear's book on *Shell-Shock :* " It has repeatedly happened that as soon as the patient was asked about his troubles he made a full statement of all that was troubling him, and was obviously relieved to confess his worries to someone who took an intelligent interest in his welfare "; and then he suggests that " there is much reason to believe that many a sinner would be saved from greater destruction could he be brave and confident enough to seek from a minister ' ghostly counsel and advice ' in the earlier stages of his sin " (p. 141).

The whole problem of religious education in England is a bigger one than can be solved by any scheme of training secular teachers or of propounding methods. Behind the teachers stands the teaching Church with its sacramental life. Priests and teachers have, too often, fallen grievously apart; and one reason may be that the Church in England has not been careful enough to train her priests to be teachers (as distinguished from exhorters and devotional pleaders), and also to be true spiritual guides of sin-laden and intellectually troubled souls. Moreover, absolution and penance do not exhaust the director's work; a little real instruction, where ignorance and genuine doubt are the trouble, may be far more fruitful from a priest to an individual than from a teacher to a number in a large class.

GERALDINE E. HODGSON.

NOTICES AND BOOK NOTES

CHRISTIANITY IN ITS MODERN EXPRESSION. By George Burman Foster, late Professor of the Philosophy of Religion in Chicago University. The Macmillan Company. 14s. net.

Professor Foster of Chicago died in December, 1918, and this book has been compiled by a brother professor from two sources. "The main body of the book is made up of the dictated portion of the lectures (delivered to his theological classes). The footnotes contain a report, also practically verbatim, of elaborations and extemporaneous remarks introduced by the lecturer at the indicated points in the main discussion." The two constituents are of about equal bulk, and what are called footnotes are not really such, for they are inserted in "chunks" into the body of the text in a smaller type. The lectures consist of two treatises, the first on the Dogmatics and the second on the Ethics of Christianity. Each is subdivided into Foundations and Superstructure, and these again are subdivided into such an intricacy of ones and twos, a's and b's, alphas and betas, as has perhaps never been seen before. There is also a good deal of academic jargon: "The unitary centre of the whole fundamental part is the fixation of the concept of Christian revelation," for example.

This is, in fact, a very tough book; hardly a book at all, but an interleaved notebook. The question therefore arises, Is it worth the trouble that it will certainly give the reader? On the whole we think it is worth while. Professor Foster was a Protestant and a Pragmatist; his lectures show him also as a man of wide reading and a vigorously inquiring mind. His "lecturese," once we have got used to it, has a kind of attractiveness. He asks ten thousand questions and answers about half of them, covering an immense amount of ground. He is entirely free from cheap emotionalism and "gas." He is, in fact, likely to set any industrious reader thinking afresh about the relationship of religion, art, and morals, about Prayer, about Eternity, about Jesus and Paul, about Christianity and Orientalism, etc.

But on one point we are baffled. Our professor remarks, in one of the footnote impromptus, "We can prove to the 'atheist' that he is not an atheist, inasmuch as he eats his dinner." But probably all of us who have lectured have said equally foolish things, only we "lacked the sacred stenographer."

D. C. SOMERVELL.

LIVES OF THE SERBIAN SAINTS. By Voyeslav Yanich, D.D., and C. Patrick Hankey, M.A. S.P.C.K. 1921. xx + 108 pp. 6s. 6d.

This selection from the Serbian martyrology will be welcome to the considerable number of people who have in recent years become attached to that much-tried nation, and will recall to them many peculiar characteristics of a people very unlike ourselves. The Lives are all taken from the classical age of Serbian history, the last three centuries of the Middle Ages. They are mostly those of the kings and bishops who created the Serbian Power in the Balkans, or heroically fought the Turk. Where they most conspicuously differ from similar Western collections is, as the

Introduction points out, in the tender reverence shown to the unsuccessful, the failures of this world. Sometimes it looks as though failure in itself was almost taken as proof of sanctity. Stephen Dechanski rebelled against his father through fear of losing the succession to the crown. He failed, was blinded, and exiled, but later was restored to both sight and position. His son, Stephen Dushan, the greatest of Serbian Tsars, rose against him precisely as he had risen against his own father. Dushan was successful, put his father out of the way, and governed firmly and well. But the rebellious son was never given the canonization which the equally rebellious father received. That spirit, however, even if it can be exaggerated, is one that the modern world (East and West) sadly needs, in order to soften its hatred for, and contempt of, suffering.

R. G. LAFFAN.

The Comfort of the Catholic Faith. By F. M. Clendenin, D.D. Longmans. 1921. 183 pp. 6s.

A number of short studies of some articles of the Nicene Creed by an American clergyman. Dr. Clendenin is anxious to set forth the Catholic faith as something "received," which is not of man's creation. We sympathize with his intention, but much of his execution is open to criticism. An apologist who is so careless that he appears to treat St. John ii. 24-5 as a saying of our Lord (p. 23); who can write: "God said, through His inspired word, the Church which He purchased with His own blood," "the Church which is His Body" (p. 64); who can lapse into nonsense so childish as "Eternity is a frightfully long time" (p. 70), cannot expect to be taken very seriously on this side of the Atlantic. If the foundations of the Catholic Faith were not broader and deeper than Dr. Clendenin seems to realize, we do not think that it would have lasted so long. Each chapter ends with quotations from well-known divines.

Glories of the Love of Jesus. By J. Brett. Longmans. 1921. 125 pp. 5s.

Mr. Brett is well known as a writer of mystical books. In this volume his main thesis is the need of saints and the danger of acquiescing in the average level of Church life. This needs to be said, and he says it well. One passage, on p. 78, looks almost as if he thought that at the Ascension our Lord travelled through space for nine consecutive days until He had reached the Father's Throne. We do not think that this can be Mr. Brett's meaning: but it is not clear to us what his real meaning is. But, despite blemishes, the book contains a good deal which seems to us to be valuable.

Four Biblical Plays. By W. H. T. Gairdner. S.P.C.K. 1921. xii + 168 pp. 5s.

The plays are: (1) Joseph and his Brethren; (2) Passover Night; (3) The Last Passover; (4) Saul and Stephen. We are not quite clear as to the desirability of dramatizing sacred stories in a mixture of Biblical and modern English, especially if the modern English sometimes degenerates into downright slang. The motive is presumably the desire to make the scenes more vividly real, and we assume that the plays are intended primarily for young people. But we wonder whether any gain which such "vivid" presentation may bring is not outweighed by the

loss of the sense of reverence which seems to us inevitable. That is, however, merely an opinion which may be ill-founded. Mr. Gairdner has certainly discharged the task which he has set himself extremely well.

Christian Unity: Its Principles and Possibilities. By The Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook. New York. 1921. Association Press. xiv. + 386 pp.

The authors and editors of this work must be thanked for having given us a very laborious compilation, which brings together much information which would not be very readily accessible otherwise. The book is divided into three main sections: I. The Present Situation; II. The Historical Background; III. The Future. It seems that the war drew the attention of many Americans to the evils of dissension, and gave considerable impetus to various movements in the direction of unity. It is natural that such movements should be strong in America, where divisions are more numerous and less justifiable than amongst ourselves, and where circumstances admit of such experiments as "Union" or "Community" Churches.

In Part II. we are glad to note the following passage: "The popular view, therefore, that before the Reformation all Christians were united in one holy Catholic Church is a fiction that cannot be sustained by historical facts." The fiction dies hard, partly because Roman controversialists have a direct interest in keeping it alive. The authors do not seem to understand the reference of the phrase "by law established" as applied to a Church. But we have never come across an American who did, and many Englishmen are in the same position.

When an American thinks of unity in matters religious, there naturally rises in his mind a picture of his political Union. There he sees a number of States whose internal arrangements differ very widely, each of which retains a considerable measure of independence. But together they constitute the Union. The analogy is hopeful, and we think that it is never very far from our authors' thoughts. But we imagine that what has made the Union possible is that all members of all States have a very clear and definite idea as to what they mean by "the American nation." Similarly, religious unity must depend very largely on some agreement as to what is meant by the words "Catholic Church," and to this the volume before us makes no contribution. Possibly it will be found eventually that the choice lies between the following alternatives: (1) a kingdom into which God invites us on His terms; (2) a club of which we elect Him Patron upon our own. There are five useful appendices containing various documents and a bibliography.

Christian Philosophy Discussed under the Topics of Absolute Values, Creative Evolution, and Religion. By Canon T. Gurnhill. Longmans. 1921. viii + 97 pp. 6s.

Canon Gurnhill's general standpoint is indicated by the debt which he acknowledges in his opening sentences to the Dean of St. Paul's. His object is to call the attention of those who are not professed philosophers to certain aspects of Christianity which they are not unlikely to overlook. We hope that his book will induce his readers to pursue the theme further, and think that if this should prove to be the case he would be well satisfied. He has produced an apologetic (or indicated the lines which one might follow) of a kind which we believe to be needed, but seldom encounter.

Modernism and Orthodoxy. By C. Cheshire. Mowbray. 1921. 14 pp. 6d.

This address, delivered at Grosvenor Chapel, contains some sound common sense. But some of Mr. Cheshire's remarks lend themselves to very damaging attack by the other side.

The British Israel Fallacy. By L. P. Erith. Mowbray. 1921. 63 pp. 1s. 6d.

The notion that we are descended from the "lost" ten tribes of Israel is a mania which finds lodging in some otherwise sane and normal minds. We have encountered it ourselves in most unexpected places. The Vice-Principal of Lichfield has effectually exposed its utter futility, with perhaps more skill and knowledge than have been directed to it before. But it is to be feared that those who hold this particular form of lunacy will be impervious to any arguments which can be laid before them.

Our Present Position: What About It? By S. Bramley-Moore, M.C. Partridge. 1921. 45 pp. 1s.

The author's object is to show that the Bible has more to say about our present position than is sometimes supposed. With his general contention we are in agreement, and his obvious sincerity demands respect. But we are bound to say that his method of Biblical interpretation is unhampered by any knowledge, and is entirely unsound.

The Constructive Value of the Bible. By W. Lock, D.D. Mowbray. 1921. 31 pp.

This admirable pamphlet was originally a public lecture delivered by the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Oxford. We hope that it will be widely read, and would particularly commend it to the attention of Mr. Bramley-Moore. But we doubt whether the Buddha can ever "meet with due honour in our worship" (p. 30), because, albeit a singularly beautiful character, his teaching is the extreme depth of pessimism. It is, therefore, hard to see how he can be said to have prepared the way in any degree for a religion which is based on invincible hope.

Who are Members of the Church? By Darwell Stone, D.D., and F. W. Puller. Pusey House Occasional Papers, No. 9. Longmans. 1921. 88 pp. 2s. 6d.

This tractate is concerned with one sentence in the Lambeth Appeal of 1920: "We acknowledge all those who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ which is His Body." The learned authors are not prepared to accept this statement, on the ground that hitherto membership in the Church has always been denied to excommunicated persons and heretics. We think that they have proved this point. Unfortunately it does not happen to be the issue. They quote the Archbishop of Armagh as saying: "The conception [*i.e.*, of the Church put forward in the appeal] is neither the old familiar institutional one nor that of the invisible Church." Dr. Stone and Mr. Puller have shown the correctness of the Archbishop's assertion. But the real point appears to us to be this: Can we be justified in holding now a conception of the Church which is admittedly not

identical with what has been generally held before? If we can, upon what grounds? If not, why not? We think that it would be extremely valuable if Dr. Stone and Mr. Puller would apply their minds to these questions. But it hardly seems to be worth while to devote eighty odd pages to proving that a certain definition is not what one of those who were chiefly concerned with framing it has already declared that it does not profess to be.

Christ and the Nicene Creed. By J. K. Mozley, B.D. R. Jackson. Leeds. 1921. 27 pp. 1s.

These two quite admirable sermons ought to be widely read. They provide a criticism of much which passed at the "Modernist" Conference at Girton last summer, which is penetrating without ever being either flippant or unfair. They will help to reassure those who are inclined to fear that "the old orthodoxy" is really "in ruins."

Aspects of the Holy Communion. By R. L. Pelly. Student Christian Movement. 1922. 47 pp. 1s.

A devout and simple little study from the Evangelical standpoint. It should be useful to those who have never been taught to think much about sacraments: particularly to Nonconformists, whose notions as to Church teaching are generally of the wildest.

Queen Anne's Bounty: A Short Account of its History and Work. By W. R. Le Fanu. Macmillan. 1921. 95 pp.

The Secretary of Queen Anne's Bounty has produced a very valuable brochure packed with information as to the history and operations of the Corporation. It is parallel with the account of the Ecclesiastical Commission which was put out by Sir Lewis Dibdin two years ago. The two together sufficiently vindicate the business efficiency of the Church of England, which ill-informed persons are prone to malign.

Peace and Happiness. By H. L. Paget, D.D. Longmans. 1922. 127 pp. 3s. 6d.

We think that it must be very difficult to write a book about nothing in particular, with a view to general edification, because someone else has asked you to do so. This is what the Bishop of Chester has set himself to do, at the request of the Bishop of London. He has taken for his theme the phrase from the prayer for Parliament—Peace and Happiness, Truth and Justice, Religion and Piety—and tries to show what manner of thing these gifts really are, and how the prayer for them may be answered. The book contains much wise and lofty counsel, but is marred by its style and an excessive desire for simplicity.

R. H. Malden.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER